

Ross Dowson archives – Vancouver and B.C. correspondence 1949

- 01_19 Letter to Reg Bullock, Ruth Bullock and Bill (W.), re: hold onto the Vancouver HQ; temporary setbacks; big gains in Toronto
- 01_19B Letter to Frank (J.), re: no retrenchments required in Vancouver; the loss of the IWA comrades; Toronto gaining contacts thru elections
- 02_1 Letter to Reg Bullock, re: ruckus in the Toronto Yugoslav group; inviting articles perhaps on the IWA situation for next issue of *LC*
- 02_22 Letter to Reg Bullock, re: possible aid, or not, from SWP in the IWA comrades situation; need to firm up Vancouver membership; the need to consult the NO on important matters; the March forum
- 02_22B Letter to Bill (W.), re: union work and press; how well Vancouver dealt with the IWA defections; his writing for the paper
- 03_04 Letter to the Vancouver Branch, re: not feasible to print membership cards
- 03_14 Letter to Ruth Bullock, re: all extra copies of *LC* sent; their forum a success; CCF meeting distributions
- 3_18 Letter to the Vancouver Branch, re: setting up a trial committee in the case of the IWA ex-comrades
- 03_25 Letter to Frank (J.), re: Vancouver branch activities welcomed, selling the (FI) Manifesto and circulation of books
- 03_25B ***Report of a trial committee meeting*** regarding charges of disloyalty against two Vancouver RWP comrades; reviewing their careers in the union and their growing distance from the party; their political differences
- 03_28 Letter to Reg Bullock, re: branch classes and suggestions for topics, a critique of his speech; situation in the CCF in BC; agree with SWP aid in IWA situation; the RWP a party without the resources of a party, unable to issue NO bulletins as Bill (W.) asks
- 03_28B Letter to Bill (W.), re: finances; agreement with SWP views on IWA comrades case, anti-Atlantic Pact movement in BC CCF
- 03_29 Letter to Bill (W.), Britannia Beach, re: the IWA case, BC CCF developments, on LC coverage of Mine-Mill developments
- 04_21 Letter to Lillian (W.), re: the CCF Atlantic Pact resolutions; plan for convention articles in LC May Day issue; LC bundles to CCF clubs

- 05_11 Letter to Lillian (W.), re: the need for changes to excellent CCF convention articles; not critical enough of CCF or its left leaders who in fact support the Atlantic Pact; explaining the edit changes
- 05_17 Letter to Reg Bullock, re: Lil's protest over *LC* CCF article changes; what is our CCF orientation? Branch activities and personnel
- 05_17B Letter to Comrades Bradley & Whalen, re: NC has decided to suspend you both on the basis of the report of the trial committee
- 06_16 Letter to Bill (W.), re: his sharp criticisms of the latest *Labor Challenge*; RD's views they border on slander; how we are to build the leadership of the Canadian party
- 06_16B Letter to the Vancouver Branch, re: the "charges" against the latest issue of *LC*; defence of the line of calling for a CCF convention over the Atlantic Pact issue; also the idea of a general strike to support the eastern asbestos workers; the need for a CCF left wing; the BC CCF coverage and *LC* appraisal of its "centrist" politics
- 06_22 Letter to Reg Bullock, re: polling cross-country opinion on the BC CCF coverage; the direction Bill and Lillian are heading in; developing opposition within the CCF over the Atlantic Pact and what tactics do we use; Toronto sub campaign success
- 06_23 Letter to Ruth Bullock, re: Toronto sub work experiences, etc.
- 06_23B Letter to the Vancouver Branch, re: request from Bill (W.) that the NC approve his accepting a union post; defer decision to branch
- 06_30 Letter to Bill W., Britannia Beach, re: the demise of Mine-Mill there; pour position in the Mine-Mill vs. CCL-CIO struggle; soul-searching within the CCF leadership, and its support of the Atlantic Pact
- 07_12 Letter to Reg Bullock, re: the BC left moving out in the *CCF News*; should RWP enter the CCF in Vancouver?
- 07_20 Letter to Bill (W.), re: big left developments in the BC CCF; a partial entry into the CCF proposed; reaction to the Internal Bulletin?
- 07_21 Letter to Frank (J.), re: branch dues & pledges; the role of treasurer
- 07_22 Letter to Ruth Bullock, re: my image as tough but oh so gentle; party doings and street-corner meetings

- 07_26 Letter to N.C. members, re: the entry of our British comrades into the BLP; relations with the Gagnon group in Montreal; the CCF in crisis across the country; the CCF left moving out in BC; the question of entry into the BC CCF; Toronto branch activities; appeal from the IS (FI) for funds
- 08_08 Note by RD: "Culled from R(eg) B(ullock)'s letter dated July 26/49, for G(renier) and Fitz;" report of discussions with BC CCF left-wingers to consolidate the left; reference to entry by Trotskyists
- 08_22 Letter to Reg Bullock, re: an unfortunate debate title counterposing RWP with CCF; need for a united front action title
- 09_01 Letter to the Vancouver Branch, re: Comrade Grenier's visit to BC and possible discussion on CCF work as well as the IWA situation
- 09_02 Letter to Bill (W.), re: sending him CCF readers' addresses; news of an oilworker unionist from Saskatchewan; still no formal declaration on IWA members' suspension from RWP by BC branch
- 09_02B Letter to Reg Bullock, re: his CCF reports; Grenier's trip to IWA convention in BC; the NC discussion on CCF entry; Don B.'s instability in Toronto improved with union job in Windsor branch; using *LC* in the CCF left; Reg's job switch to an IWA job
- 09_27B Letter to Kirt (Court), re: his fine *LC* sub renewal work; how the sub plate system works at the centre; supplying our available literature to your stock in Vancouver
- 09_27 Letter to Bill (W.), Britannia Beach, re: our ex-comrade Lloyd now isolated in the IWA; the growth of the left opposition following the CCF defeat; our contact with the left in the CCF but its lack of cohesion; attrition in Toronto
- 09_30 Letter to the Vancouver Branch, re: inviting the Vancouver branch to set a fund drive quota; some suggestions of donors
- 10_00 Undated letter found in October, to Bill (W.), "Vancouver," re: price of Militant Chorus recordings
- 10_03 Letter to Bill (W.), re: problems with the fund drive in Vancouver; Reg's upcoming article on the IWA situation
- 10_21 Letter to Reg Bullock, re: his fine articles on the IWA and the difficult treatment of the left CCF debate; the low level of workers' entry into the CCF; dealing with BC's complaint about lack of NC communication; the real national nature of *Labor Challenge*

- 10_22 Letter to Lillian (W.), re: publicizing the topics of the Vancouver educational classes; a Toronto forum on the Tito-Stalin split
- 10_23 Letter to Ruth Bullock, re: receipt of subs and money; the party's dues and pledges policy; various methods of fund raising
- 11_14 Letter to the McDonnell comrades (members-at-large), re: thanks for the donation; their contacts with Vancouver comrades
- 11_18 Letter to Reg Bullock, re: his close contact with left CCFers and the need for a BC left bulletin; the need for the left to work out a program; our need for a detailed evaluation of CCF entry; the fight for Tom's reinstatement into the IWA
- 11_30 Letter to Eve (S.), re: thanks for her book order; books in print

Bullback Bullback Whiting
Dear Reg, Ruth, Bill,

Do not give up the headquarters. We are not going to retrench.
We dont need to.

Toronto is on the threshold of making new and important gains from the election. I will consult the treasury and the N.C. members. I am convinced myself that we can manage for a time to take from Vancouver only what it has left over from maintenance of the H.Q. At anyrate let us take no action on this until we can talk it over.

The Tom Lloyd defection is nothing new....didn't we practically wipe them off the books when I was out there. Stan gone....I think that this is only a temporary mood of his...the arguments lead me to believe so. Surely he will straighten up (show him the article by Charles in the F.I.) And the others I dont know, but I am confident that if the leading comrades demonstrate the right spirit we will not only come out of this but come out in some ways better off. I do not know that Tom and Lloyd have been such a terrific asset to-date...I have seen little results from the "ability to turn people up". of th eirs. Look at who is in the branch and how they came in.

This is just a temporary set-back. Tell the comrades about the Toronto election campaign..the fine meeting we held after the campaign. Tell them that the campaign turned up almost 25 people who we are in the process of interviewing and lining up for classes to bring them closer to the party.

To give up the headquarters would be a very bad move in my opinion. Would only consolidate any feelings of defeatism that may have arisen in some of the comrades minds. Bill white informs me that a fellow in Britannia was telling him about the terrific election poll rolled up by the Trotskyists in Toronto. We are not going to retrench but on the contrary open up.

Wish I was there to give you a hand.....am thinking it over...the possibility. This is just a hurried up note. I am waiting for Reg's second instalment with great anxiety

Will write as soon as I receive the instalment

with warmest regards

Ross

January 19, 1948 ✓
1949

Johnson
(Vancouver)
Dear Comrade Frank;

Thanks for the last money order. I am enclosing a receipt. By the way you can save some money on the airmail...all four cent mail between here and the coast goes airmail now.

Sorry that you did not drop us a line or so along with the money order. ~~XXX~~ After a long silence we have just heard from both Reg and Bill about recent developments there. No doubt about it, Lloyd and Tom's defection is an unfortunate one, but after our experience when I was out there and previous incidences it should not be too much of a shock for all the comrades to readily recuperate from and go on to new gains. I think that we can honestly say that in some ways these comrades were an impediment to the development of the branch along Bolshevik lines—certainly this is true over the past four or five months. In many ways it has been a good experience for the party—a very instructive incident on what the party means and what happens to good working class types when they leave the party—for the truth is that Lloyd and Tom had in reality left the party a short time prior to the IWA split.

I am a little more sorry to hear that Stan has asked for leave of absence. While he may appear to be blasé about Tom and Lloyd I think it is possible that he has been a little more than a trifle disappointed with Lloyd and Tom now that we have been faced with their open hostility. I am sure that it is only a passing mood on Stan's part and that in no time he will be back with us building the party upon which so much, all, depends.

Retrenchments, give up the headquarters. I understand that the branch is considering doing so. I am absolutely opposed to it. We don't need to make any retrenchments in Vancouver. ...I am convinced. After all we are a national party. If Vancouver at this moment is finding it a little tough, Toronto is on the threshold of making very important and new gains. I have not yet had a chance to take the matter of Vancouver and finances up with the N.C., but I am convinced myself that other comrades will make up for the temporary inability of you comrades to carry a headquarters and pay into the financing of the paper etc. I am convinced we have to keep the headquarters there, to open up with some public activity and go forward. We can do it. We have the forces in Vancouver.

The Toronto branch is preparing to hold one or two classes to teach and instruct the many persons who have been turned up by our inspiring election campaign. Last night I was out to see a young fellow and his wife who picked up a copy of our leaflet, sent in for a sub. Excellent types, bought three or four pamphlets and are very anxious to come to our forums and classes. The other night met another fellow who wrote in for further information...a young English immigrant, who has no use for the CCF...too soft. Don was out last night talking to a student who phoned in for information about the party for a mock parliament they are having at his high school. We had an excellent meeting on the 9th. About 55 persons, considerable number CCFers, sold seven subs, about 20 pamphlets, several interest cards signed. The meeting was graced by the attendance of the secretary of the CCLC/CIO Council. We are a big issue here in Toronto. Bill White in Britannia tells us that a fellow in that little B.C. town was telling him about the Trotskyists in Toronto.

Don has been playing a leading role here. He was in charge of the sound car during the campaign and he is now making all the preparations to conduct one of the series of seven ~~IX~~ lessons ~~XXXXX~~ for the class that he is going to give. We expect to start the classes the week of the 20th.

Don is fighting mad about Tom and Lloyd and is convinced that in the long run that the branch is going to come out of it considerably stronger. He will be writing you no doubt within the next day or so. He will be probably be telling you about his trip to New York for the SWP plenum. ...where he came in contact with a party that has gone through experiences a thousand times tougher than the Lloyd Tom experience and is now well on the way to the building of a mass party that will surely usher in the socialist America.

with warmest regards

Ross Dowson

RDJ Jan 26 1949
E4-1949-VAN
February 22, 1949

R. Bullock
Vancouver

Don Robertson, SWP

Dear Reg;

I have mailed you all the copies of the last issue that there are on hand.....about 200 more. I hope this is enough to meet your needs. Mailed them about half an hour after receiving your letter so they should reach you by the 26th or 28th. You were lucky there were any left. We covered the Ontario Federation of Labor (OFL-CIO) convention and a university meeting where Buck spoke with this issue. Both distribution were rather small.

Your letter reminded me of a bad oversight on my part. When Don was in N.Y. during the Christmas holiday for the SWP plenum he had a talk with the leading U.S. comrades and the rep of the IS about Lloyd and Tom. He apparently raised the idea that it would be well if some leading comrade could go to see them and Stein informed me that it was possible that Dunne would go. They wrote me later that Dunne would be unable to do so but Lang would be going up late in March if I recall correctly.at any rate it was at a time when I knew that our relationship with them for the next period would have long been since determined. I gather that I did not tell you. I have a memo here that was to remind me to write Lang in care of Dan to let him in on the picture if he was still able to go. I knew that the main issue was going to be settled by then but was of the opinion that a talk with them would do no harm and at least it would settle this matter of their threat to take the matter to the IS. I see now that my delays have made it no longer necessary to bother about this memo.

Personally I was opposed to Dan coming into the picture when I was in Van as I knew of course that he could only line up with us and I was afraid that Tom and Lloyd would then raise the matter of interference of the SWP...that was ~~EXHIBIT~~ a danger if there was any hope in Tom and Lloyd reacting to another approach at all. I also wanted to let the comrades know that we, the Canadian party, the Vancouver branch and certain comrades in that branch were going to handle it...that it was our affair, our responsibility and we did not have to go running to anyone else.

I am glad that Dan finally managed to get up again and no doubt he has had a good effect on the branch. To tell you the truth I have been a little impatient with the slow manner that the branch has been toying with Tom and Lloyd. I have been wondering what is behind it all as I gathered from all reports that the branch was lined up on this question. But I see now that Bill was not and has been stalling and stalling.

It seems to me that you have handled this unfortunate development very well....~~AM~~ am rather amazed by Bill's actions (not his reaction but his failure to carry out the instructions of the branch in this matter) If anything Ruth's and the Branch's reaction ~~EXHIBIT~~ was very modest. I can only agree with your procedure at the executive. I see no alternative. I am hoping that he will be honest enough to see and admit his error and that we can brush over the matter until some more

favourable time. I hope that by now he has changed his mind, and that we will not be compelled to discipline him by removing him from office, it ~~will~~ would of course have a hell of effect on the branch...at anytime let alone after just what the branch has gone through...however if we have to so be it.

I hope that the Executive has gone ahead anyway with the corrected letter to Lloyd on his leave of absence so that we can settle this matter

I can only agree with the comments in your last paragraph--that the branch is weak on the organizational plane. This is one of inheritances from the Lloyd-Tom ~~was~~ period. I think that it is correct to say that they generally wanted the branch to function as a trade union caucus... not a party branch...and not as a real caucus with overall discipline but one that would line up behind them but would not bind them. One of the problems in Van is that we never ever had a real party experience..I think you can see that in Bill. My impression when there was that Bill likes to sit around and chew the rag, old times, old friends and that he has a terrible resistance to taking on new things and new tasks. To plan things, make definite decisions, take definite actions is rather alien to him.

One thing that has struck me is ~~the~~ what always appeared from here to be lack of direction, decision. Educational plans would be layed out in great detail and then would be scrapped time and time again. I did not say anything at the time but it struck me as rather odd that one Sunday that I was there we went out to do sub renewal work when the party was in the midst of a financial drive and the branch was also working the angle. I have also been rather amazed with all the various committees that the branch has particularly in view of our comparative smallness. I have often intended to raise the matter but have been postponing it until a more propitious time. And before I forget it ; the peculiar relationship that the branch has to some persons, Jack MacDonald, Lefty Morgan. I gathered when there that MacDonald is looked upon as a member and from some correspondence that Morgan looks upon himself as a member. But it seems obvious to me that neither fulfil any of the qualifications of membership. I got the impression that Stan who has left(I hope temporarily) the party because of disagreements with our program was instructed to prepare

I think one of the things that we should do right away is fill out the executive. I think we should put onto it persons who seem most likely to develop into the future leaders. In many ways a small branch of 8 or 9 people hardly needs an executive but I think it is an excellent thing in which ~~the~~ the more experienced comrades can really do a job in training some good ~~new~~ elements. I do not know what your opinion is but for the few times that I met him I formed a very good opinion of Cort and think that he would be a good type to take onto the executive. Bill in a few letters has mentioned that Cort has been needling the branch for its lack of adaisical ~~attitude~~ organizational attitude.

One of the secrets of good organization in my opinion is to take on tasks which the branch can handle, to take on tasks that have been well planned and thought out and carry them to the end. I do not mean of course that we should be overly cautious and conservative...we must give leadership to the branch and take on new tasks, gain new experiences. But when we take on something we should have thought it out well and should carry it through even if in the process we may see that it could have been better if handled some other way.

There is one matter that I would like to raise and that is the role that the N.O. can play in the development of the Vancouver branch. In the past I have been very hesitant to intercede in any of the branch doings knowing that there were persons who would meet anything of this nature with the greatest hostility. Then again there is always the desire to let the branch develop itself. But I think we can use the N.O. occasionally to good purpose. I think it would be a good idea if from time to time when some important ~~XXXX~~ contentious item hits the branch floor that the N.O. should be asked for its opinion on the matter. In the past NO ~~XXXXXX~~ missiles (they have always been unsolicited) have been met with hostility. I think we can easily overcome this . It will create a good party feeling in my opinion..you know---we are not alone here in Vancouver. And I am sure that after a while the comrades will want to know what the N.O. thinks about many questions that confront them.

You ask me "not to comment to Bill until after my report on the Wed meeting." I have ~~XXXXXX~~ written to Bill but not on any of these recent developments. I sent him a letter this morning that answers some questions he raised in recent correspondence, asks him to look into a few details and in passing makes some comments on the problem of cementing a new leadership in the branch following our Tend L experience. I also ask him for some more minutes.

Thank Ruth for the clipping and the information on Fergy's address. ~~XXXX~~ We have had a very fine winter down here...I guess Vancouver's, little snow, mild. We were forced to call off our annual toboggan party for lack of snow. ~~XXXXXX~~ One of the comrades and I took Don skiing a few weeks ago when we had three or four inches. Not very good skiers these Vancouverites. Don wrote to Stan a week or so ago but as yet has received no reply. Received your note on Faulkner of Uncas Alberta. A few days after your note I received one from Burki making the same request. Somewhere back ~~XXXXXX~~ the F.I. told us that he had a sub and we sent him some sample copies of LC asking him for a sub...he never even replied. I sent him a friendly letter and the couple of addresses we have in Edmonton. Asked him if he had anyone around him.

Very glad to see that the branch leaped right back into action with the forum you are preparing for March 3. I think that holding this forum is one of the best things that we could possibly have done. Hope we manage to get a turnout. Are you advertising it in the Sun?

Can you send a short report of it for the RWP in Action column. How are we fixed for something for this issue of the paper. I know that you will be busy but perhaps you can shove it onto Cort Bill or Ruth and then go over it before it goes on its way. Is there anything of importance taking place at the Victoria sessions. There was a conferece recently of the CCF MPP's and the unions on Bill 39 perhaps we can work it into the session and make it timely

Would you let me know if we can expect anything for this issue ~~XXXX~~ ~~XXXXXX~~ Should be here in our mail box by March 7th.

with warmest regards

Ross

February 22, 1949 ✓

Bill Whitney, Vancouver

Dear Bill;

I have just sent off in the mail 3 copies of a UAW fraction paper. Would you distribute them around the trade union activists in the branch. It will give them a good idea on how to work in their union. Our comrades play a leading role in the vaucus that prints the paper.

I am also enclosing a copy of a bibliography drawn up by ~~XXXXX~~ ~~XXXXX~~ of the Windsor comrades for a class or a short sereis on Democratic Centralism. Would you turn this over the the Educational Committee. It would seem th me that such a topic would be very valueabke for the branch following our recent experiences.

I wonder if you could ask some comrade to chack the city directoy to find the address of Isabella F Bennie. She wrote a very fine letter inot the CCF News recently and I think it would be worth while to go around to see her, have a talk, sell her a sub etc. Or perhaps the comrades already know her.

Do you know who writes the ~~XXXXX~~ column High Rigger in the IWA paper The last issue takes up the question of the U.S. UP Trial, the role of the Stalinists in the Minneapolis case, the Kutcher case and takes a very good position. He must read the Militant as he also mentions Weinstock....Labor Challenge has said nothing about this until the February issue. It would be worthwhile trying to contact him. Sometime ago I asked Lloyd and Tom to put us on the mailing list. We are only getting the paper via Don's mother. I wonder if one of the comrades could see someone about getting us an exchange. We are sending them L.C.

Now to take up a few matters that you raise in the last ~~XXXXXX~~ bit of correspondence. Have had to delay taking it up. As you know Ruth Benson has returned to the States and she leaves a real gap in the N.O. I ma finiding it terribly difficult just to keep up with the daily press, the dozens of union and other papers that come into the office so that L.C. will be able to keep up its hight standard. The last issue of L.C. is the first one that I have put out almost alone. Hitherto Murray and Ruth handled this and when Murray went to Montreal Ruth and to a very limited extent Myself. We have yet to train some other comrades in this very important field of activity but we have one coming along. How did the comrades like the last issue?

But first I would like to express waht I know is the opin on of all the N.C. members and the party. We are all very much pleased with the ~~XXXX~~ Bolshevik way that the Branch has met the defection of Lloyd and Tom. It demonstrates that we have a real core of comrades there who understand the role of the party and will conquer over all obstacles to build the party. We hope by now that the whole matter has been settled to the satisfaction of the branch ~~XXX~~ so that we can really get on with our task.

We were very glad to see that the branch bounced right back into action with a decision to hold a public meeting. This is the kind of leading ship that the more experinced and leading comrades must give

to the branch. I see from the minutes that you held a social late last month. So that we are demonstrating to anyone that may have even a wisp of a doubt that we can not only get along without Lloyd and Tom but that we are not phased a bit by the disgraceful actions.

I myself am particularly glad about the social. It is in times like this that we have to draw closer to one another. Lloyd and Tom in my opinion created a very bad atmosphere in the branch and to a certain extent infected the membership...with their prima donna attitude, their sowing of distrust about the N.O. and the rest of the party, their general inability to take any suggestions or criticisms from the branch membership, the factional atmosphere that their attitude developed (you know I can only trust Bill and Ellaline crap) etc. My impression is that they always translated their political disagreements with comrades into personal differences. They created an atmosphere of intransigence in all things. They didn't know how to compromise with anyone but the trade union bureaucracy. And of course the party can only be built on compromises---on learning how to get along with one another, accepting one another, good points and bad points. Of course there can be no compromise on political questions but even there, all things are not of equal weight and if we cannot convince one another at a given moment (an we are the ~~the~~ vanguard) we can usually afford to let life prove or settle the matter. I think the socials are very good in that comrades get to know one another outside of the political atmosphere of the branch meeting...and learn to correctly appreciate one another

You raise the question of a trip to Vancouver which I half suggested in one of my letters. I of course wasn't thinking of a trip in terms of working on Tom and Lloyd again. That seemed to me to be out of the question after our experiences through the last trip---when they ~~completely~~ absolutely refused to have anything to do with the party and even meet with me. I was thinking of it in terms of holding the branch together from what seemed a possible debacle from the reports I received. But now that situation has been ~~quite~~ pretty well straightened up and I am sure with the development of a real cooperative party atmosphere in the branch will be completely removed. It is good to see Cort's reaction. You say he is giving you the needle about "our lack of daical methods"..... good...you know he is right in amny ways....Did the branch ever think of putting him on the executive. You talk about his youth-----say old man mose it is not a matter of youth or old age. I think some of us old timers get into ruts, dilly-dally, mull over questions, lack decisiveness...we can do with a short from fellows like Cort.

I gather that you read the material I sent out on the British party. Habbe it is true has been dropped from the party. We never assimilated Habbe into the Toronto branch. He has a colossal resistance to ~~any~~ exerting any effort. And I do not think I have even met anyone in the revolutionary movement who spread so much gloom wherever he went. I think the Toronto branch finished him off. At anyrate that is what Don thinks. No one can deny that he did a certain amount of work in the branch but he never did anything without giving a thousand reasons why it would be much more comfortable to stay in the office and not do anything. According to Don he was practically out of the Vancouver branch when he left there and Don's contention is that the activities that the Toronto branch attempted to involve him in finished him off. He attended meetings up until I left for the West and we have not seen him since.

Don is sitting across the room from me working on his contribution for the bulletin that we have been trying to get out.

I have asked him the question you raise...Id he plannig to come back
.....~~HEH~~ Oh! I don't know...at least not for some while.

You are mistaken in my opinion when you say "Reg is the only one we have who is capable of giving you suitable copy" for the paper. Reg writes very well but I am convinced that we can develop others in the branch to write. What about yourself..I seem to recall that we received some items from you and while there was a disagreement about one of them ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ I thought that on the whole they were quite good. Reg being tied up with so much other work appears to have little time. What about Cort or yourself. My experience has been that I never ever seriously thought about the problems of the party until I began to write for the paper. When Reg does the job he does it well but how about trying someone else...they could go over it with Reg.

Last minutes I have are the twentieth. Can you send me another batch.

with warmst regards

Ross

March 4, 1949 ✓

To the Vancouver Branch

Dear Comrades;

We have received your enquiries as to membership cards and dues stamps.

It is correct that the founding convention of our party, in the adoption of the constitution made allowances for the printing and distribution of membership cards and dues stamps. However it was decided that it was not feasible at this time to have the cards and stamps printed.

The expense would be considerable and in the opinion of the National Committee unjustifiable in the light of the comparative smallness of our membership. It is also highly doubtful with only one comrade staffing the N.O. if we would be able to satisfactorily service a dues stamps system.

With regards to your remarks on payment of dues; comrades should not be permitted to pay dues more than three months in advance of the current month.

comradely

Ross Dowson

March 14, 1949

Dear Ruth;

(Bullock, VAN)

Received your letter on the meeting almost a week ago. Sorry I was not able to answer it, at the time we were working hard on the paper. However I figure that not receiving the extra papers you desired you would come to the conclusion that we just did not have them.

When we sent you the extra two hundred we scraped rock bottom. I gathered that you were not going to put out a leaflet and were planning to use the paper instead....as we gave you practically every copy we had. On top of our usual fifty that we keep for binding and which we never touch we held onto about 20...and these were all gone by the time we received your request. As a matter of fact if you have come across any copies in the meantime would you send us about 20.

The last issue will be a little delayed in reaching you. It did not come off the press until Monday, usually they can manage to get it off on Friday. We had to have them print half the run over a again as they made a serious typographical error...on top of this we had to fold the whole thing by hand as the new folder was not yet in good working order.

It was good to hear that your meeting was so successful. We wrote it up for the last issue but unfortunately when we came to laying it out we had to cut the local colour considerably. I had that party about a person in the audience (Charles and his wife) but regretfully had to give it the hatchet. ~~There was one fortunate outcome of all the hold up at the print shop....we managed to get the ad in for your Thursday night class.~~

21---that is quite a good attendance, who all was there aside from the chap who came down from the distribution. Have there been any awakenings lately. Glad to hear that the Catholic Action fellow was back again...too bad Spellman hadn't done his little job at the time of the meeting. It would seem to me that he must be a fair typesince he came back for more...certainly Spellman has dealt a colossal blow to the ACTU. Have we set up a contact file so that we can plan serious work on the various persons who come around---keep check on their progress and plan so to speak our relationship with them?

Well we did our best to help overcome your grief about women and distribution work. I think you will like the column we had Mary Wood write for the last issue. We follow the same technique with women at distributions....sad but we have a limited bank account at our disposal.

Glad to hear you like the sample copy stamp. Sorry we don't have time to stamp the bundles we send you. We usually get the paper out in one night and if we took time to stamp them we might not be able to

do so. Why dont we purchase a stamp out t ere ...one which also includes Cort's idea---pass it on. They are quite cheap. We could also do with a Vancouver branch stamp, but this raises once again the old problem of an address or box number in the post office. As long as the classes are on, this gives us a Vancouver address for someone to drop down to, but when it gets to be summer I assume we will be dropping the class or at least not holding it inside so we have no address again. What do you think of taking up the matter of a box again?

You will note that the program box is in this issue of the paper. We plan to carry it in every other issue of the paper. As you can see it takes a considerable amount of space for our small paper. There are about 78 pages of copy in the whole paper...the box takes about 34-- the size of a medium size article. I know that it is very good for paper distributions sub work etc. I think you will agree however that we can only afford to carry it now that we are a monthly about every other issue

The latest issue of the paper is a very good one for distribution purposes---above all CCF meetings. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ The main article is on the CCF leaders, the Atlantic pact and the considerable opposition that has developed in the CCF rank and file in opposition to the pact. I wonder if there are many CCF meetings and if we cannot possibly cover the Stanley Park membership meetings and any other club meetings that are taking place in the next few weeks. If you need more I think we can send you some. By the way is ~~XXXXXX~~ Charlie still in the CCF? I seem to recall some one mentioning that he had asked the party what he should do. Hope we can make something out of the wide spread revolt in the B.C. CCF against the Coldwell stand on the pact.

Must close now without going through the letter to catch my usual ~~XX~~ batch of mistakes or I wont get this off until tomorrow.

Will write Reg in a day or so.

comradely

Ross

March 18, 1949

To the Vancouver Branch

Dear Comrades;

We understand that there is some question as to the procedure to be followed in handling the case of Comrades Whalen and Bradely.

We would suggest that the case be handled in the following manner;

A trial committee be set up composed of the following comrades:
A. Macphese or R W Bullock, L. Whitney, R. Bullock, with Comrades Fergusson and MacDonald as alternates,

This committee is to be responsible for the drawing up of the charges, furnishing comrades Whalen and Bradley with copies of the charges in advance of the trial, setting the ~~EEEE~~ time and place of the trial, etc.

The trial is to be conducted at a designated meeting at which branch members are expected to attend.

The trial committee is subsequently to present a recommendation to the branch, the branch vote on the recommendation which is to be forwarded to the National Committee of the party for final action pending the party convention.

comradely

Ross Dowson

March 25, 1949 ✓

Frank Johnson
Vancouver;

Dear Frank;

Sorry to have been so long in sending you the receipt for the money order of \$3.25. I put it aside as I have intended to write you a short note along with it, but other work has kept postponing it up until now.

I am very sorry to hear that your father passed away and sincerely hope that it has not been too great a shock to your mother. Your father was a rather rare type of father, in that he seemed to have quite a bit in common with the interests of his sons. It is good that the family is all grown up and can soften the blow that it must have been to your mother. Give her my very best wishes.

How is the employment situation now? I gather from the press what with the reopening of some of the camps that it has eased up a bit. We have a couple of comrades down here who have been unemployed for sometime now. Don has been making the rounds when he is not working here at the office but to no avail as yet. One of the boys met Habbie recently. He has also been unemployed. The packinghouses have been the slackest in years but construction should be moving in the next few weeks. It doesn't look like this is it yet. The unemployment of course is much more than just the usual seasonal unemployment. ...but there appears to be the odd job available and as yet I do not think there ~~is~~ is any great number in the position of having no unemployment insurance to collect in the Toronto area.

Ruth sent me a report of the public meeting we held. A very good turn-out. Everyone here is favourably impressed. How did the literature go? I gather there must have been quite a few new faces that we can start to work on for party membership. It is good to hear that Cort is developing so favourably. I am convinced that it won't be long before we manage to replace Lloyd and Tom with new comrades, just as able and better in that they will be tied to the party. There is some very good material already in the branch which up until recently has had little opportunity to develop. The class is a good beginning and I hope that we can manage to get some of those contacts of our down to it.

I suppose Ruth told you that we were absolutely out of the February issue of the paper as we scrapped the bottom sending you the extra two hundred.

The distributions, the meeting and now the class convince me that we are not going to have too great a difficulty in recovering lost ground...that we have the comrades who can do the job. Dan's plan to stay there a few weeks will be an excellent experience for the branch. Dan has had considerable organizational experience which is one of our problems there. How are you coming along yourself. I hope you are managing to do a lot of very necessary reading. Did you manage to get one of the copies of the last bulletin containing the material discussed at the last IBC of the International? The experiences of our European sections contain much valuable material for us.

Say Frank, are you the literature agent now? I have intended to raise

the question of literature for sometime. New York was sending me notification of each time that Vancouver ordered any literature. I have received no news for almost a year. Are you bringing anything in?

There are a whole host of books and pamphlets that you do not have out there, or at least did not have when I was there. And of course the paper and the F.I. which no doubt all the comrades get is by no means sufficient to educate the members. I am sure that many of our comrades have not yet read some of the basic Marxist literature.

For instance no one from Vancouver wrote in for Trotsky's Lesson of Spain and What is an insurrection when we received them in the paper, and they are new pamphlets imported from India which I am doubtful if anyone has ever seen before.

What is the score on the Manifesto that we published last Fall? How many have we sold? Jim Seward at Wiseton Sack sold 30 himself. We should really put on a campaign to put this pamphlet the first one our Canadian party has published over on a big scale. Everyone we know should have a copy of this document, not only is it the most rounded exposition of our ideas available but it is a good party builder as we printed it. If possible it would be a good idea to have each comrade take five or so copies, purchase them himself and make a special drive to sell them.

1st I think we should start to really push the manifesto that we published.

2nd we should take up the matter of getting after general literature sales. We had originally agreed that Vancouver should import Pioneer publications direct from New York as it saved double postage etc. I think we should go ahead with this and bring our stock up to date. There are other items here at the N.O. that we will send you. We get a discount from the Stalinist International Publishers and of course there are a whole host of important books on their list (Lenin Marx and Engels) We have also imported pamphlets from the Br and Indian sections. We have also some important books from the Kerr list and some bourgeois publishing outfits.

Of course if we had our headgaugers and our fancy literature display stand up it would all be only a matter of keeping the stand full and bookkeeping. Now we need someone to make sure our literature is at the branch meetings so comrades can get material and above all at our classes at the Swedish Hall for our contacts.

I gathered that you are handling this work as you handle the stands. If you are not would you place this letter in the hands of the person who is....and see that this ~~XXX~~ comrade looks into the matter, possibly raising the matter of the manifesto push at the next branch meeting.

comradely

Ross Dowson

1949-BC-Mar25

Report of a trial committee regarding charges of disloyalty against two Vancouver RWP comrades

A trial committee struck off by the National Committee composed of two Vancouver comrades and a Prince Rupert N.C. member

meeting on March 25, 1949 and after hearing 6 charges laid against Tom Bradley and Lloyd Whalen recommended their suspension from the party. Their finding, subsequently reported to the Vancouver branch was endorsed unanimously by that branch and approved by the National Committee.

Both Whalen and Bradley ignored the charges and the trial committee which was formally set up by the party. Neither have signified any intention of appealing their suspension from the party.

The following were the charges:

- 1) Failure to observe the terms of a leave of absence granted by the branch in November.
- 2) Failure to maintain contact with the Trade Union fraction or the party organizations.
- 3) Failure to meet their financial obligations to the party
- 4) Accepting nominations for trade union posts without consultation with the party or party fraction.
- 5) Making alliances and entering into agreements with other groupings in the lumberworkers union without reference to the party or party fraction.
- 6) Gross disloyalty to the party organization as a whole.

Both Whalen and Bradley were elected to the National Committee at the Founding Convention of the party. Both have many years of experience in the trade union movement, the Communist Party, were known as leaders of the Trotskyist movement and today hold prominent posts in the IWA (CCL-CIO). The report, long delayed due to the inability of the comrades struck off to handle it is now drawn up to acquaint the party membership with the details of the situation leading up to the suspension. It is necessary for the party to absorb the lessons of its experiences with these two comrades and make this experience part of the armament of the party for the future.

Both Whalen and Bradley are proletarian trade union activists of considerable experience. Shot up overnight after long and plodding fraction work in the IWA to leaders in a struggle with right-wing elements against the Stalinists, they lost sight of the party. Their transformation from leaders of a persecuted and harassed fraction to leaders of a mass movement gave them allusions of grandeur. It led them to completely disregard the fraction of their own party in the IWA, the branch of which they were members, and the National Committee to which they were elected in the Canadian Trotskyist movement. They thought themselves bigger than the party – they didn't

need it anymore. They wanted to be free of the advice and guidance of this small group of revolutionaries who from their lofty positions they grew to disdain. What did this little political party know about trade unions, what could it tell them, leaders of thousands – they thought.

Instead of organizing their forces from below amongst the militants, instead of working through the party caucus with trusted and tried revolutionists, instead of working through the Vancouver branch and the national organization, they haughtily disregarded the most matured and advanced workers in the union, their own comrades and their own party. For this they substituted confabs, conferences deals and saw-offs with the right wing trade union bureaucrats and all kinds of opportunists who were thrown up by the struggle. They had no time to consult with their comrades.

Not only did (were) they content with rejecting the advice, cooperation and political leadership of their own comrades, and attempt to carry on the struggle from on top, they made alliances with various groupings in the union to cramp and prevent the rise in influence of our fraction, and they continued on the road to make disparaging and slanderous remarks about our party and its personnel.

The party was confronted with the question as to whether trade union functionaries were going to be permitted to lay down the law to the party, to ignore its fractions and to attempt to isolate it, or does the party lay down the law to its trade unionists and trade union functionaries.

If there can be any fault found with the party's conduct of this case it can only be that it may have gone too far in leaving every door open in granting every possible opportunity to these comrades to turn back from their course. The party leadership, nationally and on the West Coast humbled itself, pleaded with them to consult with us. It even went so far as to grant them leaves of absence in the midst of this most favourable trade union development that has yet confronted the RWP.

When the Stalinists pulled their miserable forces out of the IWA leaving the way open for our comrades to move in, to reestablish the IWA and to take over leadership of it, Whalen and Bradley cut themselves off from the party. The National Secretary who arrived in the midst of this promising development was stalled off day after day from consultation with these comrades who had no time for such things and was forced to have snatches of conversations such as the only one had with Bradley, 15 minutes on the dock while waiting for a boat. Another N.C. member who came over 300 miles attempted to have an interview with these Napoleons if only over coffee in a lunch room with no success.

The struggle against Stalinist domination of the IWA came to a climax after our fraction under the leadership of Whalen and Bradley had been battling for years when the Stalinists split away and set up the phony WUIC. The Stalinists left a complete chaos behind them, the whole situation was in flux. The right wing international leadership was desperately grasping for help from any quarter. Our party fraction and the rank and file caucus which we had built over the years was in a key position to raise itself into the leadership in the Vancouver area and to establish the ground for a mass basis for our movement in the West Coast. But Whalen and Bradley cut themselves off from the party and went alone. In the three weeks following the

climactic split the national secretary was able to contact Bradley only once and Whalen only three times, informally at his home, at a branch meeting and at one trade union fraction meeting arranged specifically for his convenience. Neither comrade for fully a week from the Stalinist split-away had any contact with the party or the party caucus in the IWA.

Under considerable pressure from various comrades Whalen finally appeared at a branch meeting at which he gave a detailed report of his activities and perspective and immediately demanded a leave of absence. This was pistol leveled at the head of the branch. The branch leaned over backwards to accommodate this “leader of masses” and granted the (the two comrades exemption from attending) the IWA fraction and (from) attending all its meetings.

Whalen (and Bradley who never troubled with even this formality but was understood to be covered by it) never lived up to any this unprecedented leave of absence, never attended any fraction meetings, never consulted any of our IWA members and studiously evaded any contact with us at any time.

Once on their way they did not stop at putting themselves outside the party and its influence but they declared their determined opposition to the party’s caucus in the IWA. When one of our comrades stood for and was elected to a post on the emergency executive Whalen openly voiced his displeasure. The party fraction went to the Vancouver local nomination meeting on January 9th without having been able to consult with either Bradley or Whalen. Whalen upon being called by phone informed a party fraction convenor that the Rank and File caucus was bankrupt and there was no use calling it together. But at the meeting it was clearly revealed that Whalen and Bradley were working through new channels on a slate which had been lined up and which excluded our party fraction.

While Whalen purchased himself a car in keeping with his new station neither paid dues nor contributed to the party fund drive. When approached by one of the comrades they said that they “would not give a red cent to Dowson” whom they in their contempt for the party equate with the party. Comrade Whitney testified at the trial that “Whalen remarked that he did not want a damn thing to do with the RWP—had no use for the National Secretary and nothing could be done about removing him — that he had no objection to the International — that he had contacts with which he could build his own party — made very strong criticism of the press.”

In the official proceedings of the 12th Annual Convention of B.C. District Council No. 1, Whalen speaking on political action in support of the CCF is quoted as saying: “...and I say to each and everyone of you, whether it is the CCF or the LPP or the RWP or any other political party, they are not coming in as far as I am concerned to dominate and control and choke this union.”

Not content with slandering the party publicly Whalen attempted to make a deal with a party comrade (SS) outside the party influence and against the party. In a meeting with this comrade on Feb. 10th after relating a tale of woe how he was being squeezed by various forces on the executive and was carrying on practically a lone-handed battle he asked for some aid in executing some maneuvers to wipe out a couple of opportunists who stood in his way. He violently disposed of the suggestion that he build a caucus around our party forces with the

words: “You can’t build a party around the present branch membership. They don’t know anything about party building and don’t understand how to work in the trade unions... and they won’t accept the leadership of those who do...”

The following is from Comrade S’s report of his conversation with Whalen, from a report of an IWA fraction meeting of Feb. 12: “Comrade S pointed out that while he had formerly agreed with Whalen on some of his criticisms of the Branch and the party’s stand on some questions he had found that in practically every instance the party and the branch had been right. Challenged, he cited the party prognosis of development in the IWA of the tendencies and trends to be expected — all of which Whalen was confirming with his complaints. He reminded Whalen, in fact challenged him as to what elements he was going to use to build his group in the IWA. Whalen said they would have to go to work and discover them. Comrade S then mentioned that Whalen was rejecting the already politicized comrades represented by the party fraction and admitting he had no ready prospects; that he should again remember that three members of the present executive of the union whom he wanted to eliminate had been named in the branch by Whalen himself as “prospective candidates for the party.” That when he had done this he had been angered because the branch had characterized them as unstable and unreliable elements; in fact with one the branch had pointed out his dangerous connections with the Catholic Action group, and with another his unsavory history with the CP and CCF and the trade unions. Again the Branch had been correct and Whalen wrong...”

And so Whalen and Bradley have run the whole course. Swept off their feet by their meteoric rise in the mass movement, filled with illusions that as militants, they can retain their posts and ideas through trickery and deals on top with various brands of opportunists etc., these “leaders” couldn’t suffer the indignity of having to confront the collective leadership and experience of a little party with a tiny headquarters on Cordova Street. They could not be leaders among equals. They thought they knew more than the party and its collective experience.

Just as a few weeks prior to the IWA rupture they announced in a strident and definitive voice their rejection of the Soviet Union as a degenerate worker’s state and then subsequently refused to defend their position before the membership, so they refused to defend or account for their actions in the IWA before the party membership.

The N.C. and the Vancouver branch by suspending these two comrades only reaffirms the fact that the Revolutionary Workers Party won’t be dictated to by any prima donnas... that all members, yes even including “leaders” such as Whalen and Bradley will carry out the majority decisions of the party, that our political party will direct the work of all its members in the trade unions, that it won’t be bulldozed by “leaders” but is governed by the principles of democratic centralism and its revolutionary ideas.

(end)

March 28, 1949

(Bullock)
Dear Reg;

Sorry to be so long in replying to yours of the 14th. However as soon as I received your suggestion to send off a letter to the branch on T and L affair I did so. I have let the rest ride in favour of other more pressing work.....and have only managed to get around to your mail today.

We were all very glad to see the branch hold the public meeting and now the classes on the history of the working class. A very good attendance at the forum. We are now anxious to know how the class is coming along. Do you need any material for the class. We have some excellent literature on this question. But I suppose you have quite a bit on the early formative days of the English working class. We would be glad to send you anything you need and we have. Incidentally when you get to Canada you will find some worth while material in Logan's Trade Unions in Canada. As far as I can make out now we will be carrying the history of the Winnipeg General strike in the next issue of the paper.

Do you mind if I say a word or two on the topic that the branch chose for the forum. It does not seem to me to be a good one. The more radical workers that we can hope to attract are not looking to the Trotskyists for a practical program to fight unemployment. Unfortunately they are still looking to the CCF and the trade union leadership for this. It seems to me that the workers that we can hope to attract to a party meeting are looking to us to explain the international situation, the war drive, the Atlantic Pact, the possibilities of the revolution in Canada, the role of the CCF leadership, the IPP, etc. We need to speak on topics that differentiate us from the CCF- trade union bureaucracy, the IPP, that explain the reasons for our independent existence. It may appear at first glance that such topics as how to fight unemployment would be more popular and provide us with a larger crowd but I think that a second thought would lead us to the conclusion that at this time just the opposite is the case. Our party at this stage in the development of the Canadian working class has a very select appeal.....its main appeal is to CCF and IPPers and ~~XXXXXXXX~~ of their peripheries and we have to address ourselves to them. ~~XXXXXXXX~~

On the whole I think that your speech was very good. Although there were a couple of formulations on the nature of the transitional program that were a little unfortunate; "measures that will lead first; to an amelioration of the conditions....a program which will....lead to an easing of the conditions of life under capitalism." These formulations make it appear that the transitional program is a reform program whereas of course its purpose is to destroy capitalism and teach the workers that in the preservation of their present conditions even, it will be necessary for them to overthrow capitalism. Rather than "ease" their conditions of life under capitalism I think it would be much more correct that it is first designed to defend their living standards their rights against capitalist ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ encroachments (and in this period of the death agony of capitalism this defence is revolutionary) 2nd, 3rd and so on.

Sorry that it appears in such a mutilated form in the paper. I had that very vivid ~~XXXX~~ episode about Charles and his neighbour in the article (Ruth sent it in) but had to cut it out in order to squeeze the article in the allotted space.

No doubt you have been following recent developments in the CCF very closely. How we managed to make any contact with the opponents of the Atlantic Pact. A pity that we have insufficient ~~XXX~~ forces at our disposal to maintain a fraction in the CCF.

Dan Robertson (SWP)

Has Charlei managed to turn up anything in the club of which he is a member. Byron Johnson seems to be making considerable headway in his area. He tells me that there are several anti-Atlantic Pact resolutions ~~XXXX~~ from various clubs that will be presented at the coming CCF Convention. I have asked him to send me a copy of the resolutions. I am thinking that it might be a good idea to follow up on our last CCF-Atlantic Pact article with an analysis of these resolutions....so far the opposition appears to be rejecting the Atlantic Pact on the basis that it by-passes the United Nations.

In the past week the Toronto branch has done its utmost to try to contact CCFers. Unfortunately we have no real connections at all. The CCL-PAC held a school here over the week-end, we covered that along with the business meetings of three of the clubs that met since the last issue of the paper came off. We also covered the CCL Council which is pretty well dominated by the CCF machine. This coming Sunday we are holding a meeting at a rather well frequented public hall on the Atlantic Pact in the hopes that we can manage to break through our isolation. Don and I are speaking.

It would seem that opportunities are much better in B.C., the opposition is much more extensive, their is a tradition of rebellion against the leadership, the movement is more left, etc. Hope we are investigating every possible angle to capitalize on ~~XXXX~~ opposition which is the first important one since the M.P.'s support of World War II (that is aside from our fight of almost three years ago.).

I wonder if it would not be worth while mailing the last issue of the paper fairly widely to the various persons that you and other comrades know in the CCF in Van. How did you like the article in the last issue. I hope that the CCF diddidents will feel that Labor Challenge is a paper that will provide them with arguments in the fight against Coldwell and Lewsi. I think that it should be well received by them.

Dan sent ~~XX~~ a report inot the SWP national office on his recent trip to Vancouver. They sent us a copy. Stein thinks Dan's refusal to see L and T was a mistake and asked our opinion. I told him that we were in complete agreement with Dan's actions and his evaluation of this situation. I also agreed with their proposal that Lang should still go up to see them...not that I think that we will swing them back at this time...but so that we can scotch this talk about going to the IS and so that the IS can evaluate the branch's actions for itself. Then too it will probably create a better relationship with T and L and possibly make it easier for them to come back at a later period. if they feel so inclined.

At the same time I raised the matter of Dan taking time off from Seattle to go and stay in Van for a week or so. Bill asked that I should do so as I gather Dan will be in a position to come up due to another comrade coming up to Seattle from Los Angeles. I have not heard any further word.

Incidentally how are we making out with T and L. Has the affair been wound up yet. Havent heard from Bill for some while. I hope that the committe was acceptable. Pretty well composed of who you suggested except for one switch if I recall correctly. I was of the opinion that an N.C. member should be on the committee, and if Angus was unable to attend the way you had it there would not have been an N.C. member so I made a slight change to put you in on it. Hope this met with everyone's agreement. Are we going to have a statement on this experience for the education of the party. All the comrades in the party know T and L and know them as leaders. They cannot be expelled without a suitable statment and explanation to the members. Hope you and Bill or others have time to get to work on this and can forward it in for distribution to the party as soon as possible.

Read Bill's letter to you on the minor crisis that developed last month. Glad to

see that we have strightened it up without too much fuss. I hope that we can forget all about it. I gather from a short note from Bill that he is rather triumphant about it however it is really small potatoes and we can write it off to Bill's tendency to be cantankerous and petty on occasions. And I am sure that this tendency is going to dissappear as we widen our work and make new contacts.

By the way there is one thing that he is pushing right now which can have a bad effect on the development of the party. It is this matter of the N.O. functioning like he beleives an N.O. should. He had adopted an attitude that goes like this....alright now we are ready to recognize that the Canadian party exists as a party a section of the Fourth International...now you guys down at 87 have to come across with the goods." But of course what we must demand is recognition of the RWP not as a aptry in size ,ability, influence but in orientation. He had been pressing very hard for some type of monthly organizational report from the N.O. I am very much embarassed. I wish we could answer his demands. Unfortunatley we can't On the baiss of our present staff(yours truly) it is just impossible. We need another functionary but we cannot afford it. I shouldn't say that it embarasses me for I know ~~myself~~. I am doing all I can to meet my responsibilities...it aggravates me more correctly. Of course this is not important---what it does to me. I am afraid that it can easily develop into the same old situation of distrust, lack of confidence in the N.O, the N.C. and thus in the party itself which we are attempting to build.

I think that the comrades should know that we are a party but we are without the resources of a party, and unable to function as a party should. We are a party and not a league because we are a distinct political tendency separate and apart from all other tendencies in the labor movement--as the only revolutionary communist tendency. We are a party separate and apart from the American SWP and all other sections of the Fourth International because Canada exists as a geographical, political and cultural entity having problems separate and distinct from the prblms confronting all other sections of the Fourth. In reality however we are a propoganda group with the perspective of becoming a party, with one functionary, with no resident P.C. etc.

In a letter of the 25th Feb he says "Now for once again mentioning about reports for the Branch from the N.O. We have impressed the comrades here, ourselves included that we are a national party(around the L and T affair) and it is important that for the next period that the Toronto branch and other party news be passed on immediately to the party here. How about a monthly N.C. report. Reg is to give one at every meeting now for the N.C. but I foresee difficulties as to his reporting uncompleted N.C. discussions and a matter of discipline. At any rate the N.O. should give us a report direct in order to register the importance of the center."

I do not know if Bill ever makes any remarks along this line in the branch meetings. If he does you might do a little work to correct it.

Have had no word on the Vancouver share of the \$100 we promised the IS for the setting up of the Far East Sub-Secretariat. I wonder if you could check up on it. For your information I sent Frank a lengthy letter a few days ago on the pushing of literature in the branch and public meetings. Since he handles the newsstands I gather that Stna turned over the literature to him also. Have also mailed Bill a list of expired subs in Vancouver area which I hope we can clear up within the next two or three weeks. Would like to clear the decks for a sub drive this spring.

We have done nothing further on the Carr case. Murray and Jean did not send the letter onto the attorney but instead arranged for a talk with the Ottawa correspondent of the Standard who said he would investigate the passport incident. ~~Now~~ Murray was in Toronto a couple of week-ends ago and in the process of the discussion on the case he mentioned that the letter I drew up assumed that Carr was guilty of the charge laid against him by the Crown. As a matter of fact I had not noticed this and obviously we

would be committing a great error to present our case on this assumption. We are holding further action until we see if the Standard does anything. This would be the best possible break...it has a circulation of 400,000. The case is not coming up until late in April so we can afford to wait. In the meantime I am going to work on a draft that would be free of any acceptance of the Crown's charges against Carr.

I meant to suggest that the branch consider holding a public meeting on the Atlantic Pact and the CCF leadership if it is at all practical.

Will be writing again shortly

Have we got anything lined up for the coming issue of the paper.

comradely

Ross

March 28, 1949 ✓

(Whitney)
Dear Bill;

Enclosed you will find a listing of expired subs in the Vancouver area. All these persons received the last issue of the paper and a notice that their subscription has expired. The expiration notices were sent out about 4 days ago so that there has been insufficient time for us to receive renewals via mail. We will let you know of any renewals that come in. Would the branch attempt to cover the list just as soon as possible

I hope that you received the letter on the trial committee and we are well on the way to drawing the balance sheet of this experience. We have written the SWP National Office requesting their authority for the plans that the branch has projected with Dan. As yet we have had no reply.

We have had no word yet of the Vancouver branch contribution towards the \$100 that we obligated ourselves to advance for the setting up of the Far Eastern Sub-Secretariat. We promised this money by the end of March so that I will be required to advance the money from current funds on hand unless we receive Vancouver's contribution in the next day or so. I wonder if you would check up on the Comrade who was assigned to handle this project.

For the information of the branch executive; A few weeks ago we received a letter from the National Office of the SWP enclosing a copy of a report by D.R. of his recent visit to Vancouver. They asked our opinion of Comrade D's report and their proposal that comrade L make another attempt at a later date to see both T and L. We expressed our complete agreement with Comrade D.R. report and actions and our agreement that L, despite the present actions being carried out by the Canadian party, should attempt to see T and L again.

No doubt the entire branch has been following very closely the recent opposition that has been developing in the ranks of the CCF to the leadership's support of the Atlantic Pact. The opposition in B.C. appears to be much more extensive and vocal than elsewhere encompassing even important sections of the provincial leadership. While it is true that the opponents of the pact do not take a correct Position...opposing it because in their opinion it by-passes the Wall Street dominated United Nations....nonetheless they recognize the pact as a big step towards war and are identifying their leadership as supporting this step. It is the first extensive revolt against the leadership since their support of World War II aside from the opposition that we led 2½ years ago.

It is very important that our comrades make every attempt to contact this opposition, give it guidance and a revolutionary direction. It is highly possible that we can make some immediate and concrete gains and at the very least a valuable sympathy for our ideas, press and party. The Toronto branch is distributing the paper at every CCF meeting it can possibly find; Club business meetings, union PAC meetings, etc. They are also ditching their forum schedule to hold a mass meeting in a public hall on the Atlantic Pact. We think it advisable that the Vancouver comrades concentrate their distributions on the CCF and consider the possibility of holding a public meeting on the Pact. The Vancouver branch has considerable contact with diverse elements in the CCF. We think it would be very good to contact as many of these persons as possible with our press, personal

discussions ,etc. We understand that one of our comrades has considerable influence and prestige in one of the clubs. The branch should pay special attention to aiding this comrade in working in the CCF.

Congratulations on the public meetingquite a good attendance. Hope your classes are equally succesful

comradely

Ross Dowson

Here is a list of B.C. names obtained from letters to the editor column in the CCF press. All of them do not give street addresses but these can be obtained from a directory. The letters dealt on various questions but were generally of a good character. Perhaps we can contact one or two of them. They all received the last issue of the paper(those with street addresses)

R.F. Bayliss, Crawford Bay
G.S. Clark Squamish
Fred S. Faulkner, Victoria
W. Makie, Ganges

Mildred MacLeod, Nanaimo
Zella Ross, Prince George
Bert Huffman, Newton Station
John Christie, 6625 Fleming St. Vancouver

March 29, 1949

Britannia, B.C.

Dear Comrade Bill;

I have only now managed to obtain a copy of ~~XXXX~~ Debs' Speeches and Writings for you. Sent it on its way a few days ago as you should receive it any day now. It's \$2.25

Reg tells me you were in Vancouver a few weeks ago and he was able to give you all the latest developments. Did he tell you that they are arranging to hold almost two weeks of intensive educational work with the aid of Dan who is taking that much time off. I am not sure of the dateyou might write Reg and find out. It would be very good if you can arrange to be there at least for the week-ends.

No doubt you were pleasantly surprised to see how well the branch has stood up under T and L's defection. Reg has developed a great deal under this experience and I gather so have many of the other comrades. Cort Gray chaired the public meeting they held a few weeks ago and they tell me he did a good job. There was about 21 persons in attendance and now the branch is going forward with the organization of a class that meets every other week on the history and development of the working class movement.

New opportunities are opening up for work in the recent and extensive opposition that has developed above all in the B.C. CCF to the leadership's support of the Atlantic Pact. Byron Johnson tells us that there are several resolutions that will be presented to the coming Provincial Convention opposing the Atlantic Pact. What's the score in Britannia. Is there a functioning CCF group there. Do you have any contact with it. It is ironical that the Stalinists should have just taken their ultra leftist turn on the CCF equating it with the Liberals and Tories when this important opposition to the CCF leadership has developed. They have certainly cut themselves off from even hoping to influence its development. Indeed the opposition to the Pact takes the liberal-Stalinist line that the Pact by-passes the UN which would have made it all the easier for them to contact it. I hope we can make some contact with the dissidents and ~~XXXXXX~~ attempt to give them a revolutionary direction. We will probably have another article on this development in the coming issue of the paper. We have distributed the last one to as many CCFers as we could.

I would be very much interested in receiving ~~XXXXXX~~ whatever information you could give us on the recent developments in Mine Mill. Last issue of the Pacific Tribune carried an article on the West Coast convention and Mosher's speech ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ I gather that an opposition has sprung up to the Stalinist leadership. What is its nature. Is it just a stooge outfit for Mosher and Coy. The Stalinists don't seem to be able to do much of a job on it. They mean that "the disruptive minority has been seeking to confuse the membership by avoiding fighting district leadership on such crucial ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ issues as wages, speed-up and the fight against raiding." In other words I would gather that this minority has been very cautious, has taken a good position on wages, speed-up, and has been careful to conduct its fight against the Stalinist leadership as such. The Stalinists are irritated that they have been unable to picture it as being against wage increases, in favour of the speed up etc.

What does the future hold for the Britannia local and for that matter the rest of Mine Mill ~~XXXX~~. Have Mosher and Coy got a foot hold in some of the locals which they are building up as an alternative leadership. If so what is its nature and where do we stand in relationship to these forces?

April 21, 1949 /

Whitney
Dear Comrade Lillian;

I received your letter written the 17th, post-marked the 19th at 2 p.m., only this morning.

I assume by now that you have received your copy of the April issue of the paper and that Reg has received the bundles.

We have been going to press for the last while ~~LAWYER~~ about the middle of the month which automatically prevented us from hoping to cover the CCF Convention with the April issue. We did the best we could under the circumstances however by reproducing the Atlantic Pact resolutions, a reply to them, a report on the M.P.'s voting position and an exceedingly long article on ~~THE~~ the Pact itself. And for good measure we reproduced Eve Smith's letter to the editor....all told The CCF and the Atlantic Pact took well over a quarter of the April issue not counting the expose on the Japanese question.

I took time out on Sunday to go through recent issues of the CCF press ~~to~~ pick out names and addresses of executive members of clubs in localities where no street address was needed. The comrades mailed these out last night....about 100 all told...enclosed the last two issues of the paper. B.C.

I assume since your letter is dated the 17th and you had not yet received the April issue that you thought we had not yet gone to press with it. Does this answer your suggestion that we put out a special issue with the front page devoted in large part to a coverage of the convention?...or are you suggesting an extra issue of the paper be published let us say a May issue and a mid-May issue.

Everyone I am sure is anxious that the next issue of LC should really do a job on the B.C. Convention. However since the delegates have long since returned home and many of them ~~XXX~~ have already reported to their clubs or will have by the time we could get another issue out and in B.C. if we started right away to go to press....I can see little need for us to put out an extra issue of the paper. It takes us a week and a half to see the paper through the presses now...now that we have only one person on the staff. If we started right away to go to press we could not get a paper into your hands there in Vancouver before May the fourth or third.

What I favour is this...that we should go to press with the May issue as soon as I return from Montreal this week-end. That means that we should be able to get it from the printer by the 4th and in your hands by the ninth at the latest.

If this is agreeable then we should get to work on the convention material right away. We want the bulk of the copy here by the 27th or 28th. Any photos that you can obtain should be here at that time so we will be able to get them to the lithographers in good time. Mats are preferred. The comrades will recall that the Sun gave us the mats on the IWA...this is a big saving if they have any good ones we can use

How much copy do you have on the Convention? There were no reports here aside from ~~THE~~ a short one that the convention voted down a resolution opposing support of the pact. It would be best if the comrades can devise some way of dividing the material into two or three articles. ...or two articles and an edit. An article over 6 1/2 to 7 pages is too long for our small paper.

Very glad to see that Labor Challenge had a reporter on hand. I think that your article should cover the convention as a whole...the mood of the delegates, the attitude of the CCF bureaucrats, the confusion and lack of clear policy, the significance of the convention, the future of the opposition. I am sure that you can do a good job---chatty, with lots of punch, personal etc etc. Perhaps that last item, the future of the opposition could be another article analysing the position of the opposition on the fact, the significance of their victory over Lewis, the future course they must follow.

Of course it is all in your comrades' hands since we are pretty well in the dark as to what took place. If the proposal to go to press earlier meets with your agreement then will you send me the bulk of the copy by the 27th or 28th.the 30th will be the dead deadline for any last minute material.

Think that it is a good idea to send bundles to all the clubs~~XXXXXX~~ should also try to get as full a list of names and addresses of CCFers as we can....cover all CCF club meetings in the Vancouver area etc. What is the possibility of holding a meeting on the CCF and the Pact? However no doubt you are holding a May Day meeting and it would be good enough to make the bulk of one of the speeches on the war danger the CCF and the B.C. opposition.

Aside from the finished articles...would you send me all the material that you have on this terrific development. I have asked Byron Johnson who supplied us with the resolutions to send me a long letter on his impressions. Hope the branch has had a rounded discussion on these developments.

We will interpret silence on this note to signify that you comrades are agreeable with the idea of taking the paper to press early this month and that we will get the bulk of the material on the 27 or 28th.

comradely

Ross Dowson

May 11, 1949

Lillian Whitney
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Comrade Lillian;

By now you must have had an opportunity to have gone over the last issue of Labor Challenge very closely and are waiting to hear from me as to all the changes that were made. I think that it would be a good idea to get all the comrades together who wrote or made contributions ~~to the last issue~~ to all the material that you sent in and have a discussion. This can be my contribution to the discussion.

First in view of the extent of the changes that I made I want to tell all of the comrades involved that I think we did an excellent job. After all none of us are journalists including myself and it is no mean job to really cover a convention as you did. It was an excellent idea to send one of the comrades as a reporter to the convention...we should do this more often when interesting developments take place in Vancouver, interviews, on the spot pictures. It was a good idea to get the mats even though we did not use them. And the coverage on the whole was excellent.

Well why the changes? Some of the changes were forced on us by the technical nature and limitations of our paper so let us dispose of them first. I think all told there were 8 articles submitted varying in length from $4\frac{1}{2}$ pages to 1 page, most of them around two and two and a half pages. If you will look over back issues of our paper you will find that we never carry more than 6 possibly seven articles to a page. The average length of our articles are around three and a half pages of copy, a box one page. If we had taken the material as it was we would have changed seriously the whole typography and lay-out of our paper. While I know that on many occasions many of our articles are too long, short articles also have their disadvantages. They actually take up more space because they all require space for headlines. A lot of them make the paper look like a hodge-podge, and wreck the appearance of the paper...from a lay-out point of view and so a readability point of view.

We did not use any of the mats. First they are not the type of mats that we usually want...we take those slick photo jobs only in desperation to break up a page. I did have Young and Winch's cast but at the last moment did not use them. For one thing Young rated on his position on the Atlantic Pact. I have sent Reg a copy of his speech in Hansard. We certainly could not report what he said in the convention, then what he did in the House and put it all in a cut line. I had to purge him from the article and do the same with his photo or we would have had to write another article (we can do this next issue) The kind of mats that we want are convention mats, or photos of someone who took a good position. These mats are of persons who are our political enemies and they are very pretty-pretty, flattering photos. As I say we use mats like those when we are desperately looking for something to break up the page, for lay-out purposes....as a last resort.

One of the comrades wanted the CCF developments to take over the front page. I think that this would be a good idea if we were a fraction in the CCF and this was a fraction paper.and certainly if the circulation was only in or bulk in B.C. However L.C. is the official organ of the party. It is only a monthly. It has to in some way reflect what is going on in this country and the world. Over half the circulation of the paper

is in Toronto.

is in Toronto. A great many of our readers are not in the CCF and are only mildly interested in the CCF. We can't have the front page a blank for them. While the CCF developments are important they are not the most important in the world. ~~XXXX~~ ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~. I think it would be a political error for us to give more of the front page to the CCF Convention than we did. One of the comrades suggested that the program box go on the front page. I do not see any reason for this suggested change. You can't go ripping up your lay-out from issue to issue. People expect and want to see your paper have the same general appearance from issue to issue. They want to feel at home when they pick up your paper, that they know where things are. I am talking particularly about workers. Some screw ball limited circulation, what are addressed to the intellectuals go in for snazzy unpredictable, change-every-time lay-outs but no papers that address themselves to the workers do...or they wouldn't get to first base. I think by removing the box every other issue we prevent it becoming a dead space in the paper. I hope that explains the mats, front page, program box. Now for the material

There is one thing wrong with all the material in my opinion comrades and that is that it is altogether too non-critical. You do a good job in exposing the National leadership of the CCF but with everyone else you are non-critical. Of course we should be shappiest with the bureaucracy, they are outside the pale. But what about Steeves, what about Cameron, the CCYM. There was no attempt or very little attempt made to evaluate their position which was wrong from the word go. And after all these people, the Camerons and Steeves are not novices, people moving to the left, seeing the light and going to be influenced and brought along by a soft pat on the back. As a matter of fact it is these wretched persons who are the biggest barrier to the healthy development of a genuine left wing on the West Coast. All the articles had a centrist character, which is not at all the position of critical support, the revolutionary position on the CCF. Of course the position of the opponents to the Pact is a phony one...that is in the case of Young, Steeves etc....in the case of the rank and file a position based on ignorance. There was to my memory no differentiation made between the case hardened centrists and the workers delegates looking for a correct and honest position..for a lead.

You say Cameron and Young both opposed to the Atlantic Pact. Angus MacInnis opposed to pact on pacifist UN basis. The truth is of course and it was revealed clearly in the convention none of these persons are opposed to the pact. That's just their words— unadulterated demagoguery lies. MacInnis voted for the pact a month ago. Both Young and he voted a few weeks ago. Your article on the CCYM says that "The CCYM in closing its sessions is merely on record as opposed to military pacts and continuing the policy of support to UN." The article is headed CCYM OPPOSES ATLANTIC PACT. But it turns out that it did just the opposite by supporting the National Councils position with a reservation, the big thing is that it supported the pact to my mind and not its very ignorant reservation which is completely devoid of any class understanding. Just out of curiosity I checked up on ~~XXXX~~ Tecumseh CCYM which you say "showed encouraging independent thinking although lacking South Burnaby's clarity." The one resolution "not all alliances or treaties have proven themselves as instruments of developing peace." The other "for the establishment of world Government." Well I don't think we can treat all differences with Coldwell regardless of what they are as good things. These two resolutions are colossal stupidities.

Our paper, its articles, have to give leadership, direction. We have to advance our ideas. All these articles have too tolerant a attitude towards anything that shows even the smallest difference with the bureaucracy.

There is a certain fatalism, automatism in the articles that all this odds and ends of criticism will all turn out for the best somehow. for example;

The worker delegates could see the class struggles of the future taking place and they were prepared to meet them audaciously. It is true that although they did not give expression to any conception of workers control of industry, the manner

in which they appeared to be willing to battle the capitalists (and their own leadership) would lead them in the long run to accept the Marxist scientific program. The rank and file program, confused and weak as it was, would lead in the end to revolutionary socialism and workers control of the means of production. The official program of the leadership leads to bankruptcy and betrayal."

How can we say the rank and file program would lead in the end to revolutionary socialism. First the opposition is on such a low political plane, its under the domination of a centrist leadership. It has no program or its program is so elemental as to be tantamount to being no program. Our task is to warn them cry the alarm for this terrible weakness, that's why you were tricked at the convention and so on. I think we tend to pat them on the back too long. Yes we have to encourage them but give them a yank too.

There was one article that I thought was very good just as it stood. That was the one on the sales tax. As a matter of fact we have it set up. It was already to go in page 3 but we found that we had the wrong measurement on the May Day article and had no room for it. I am planning on putting it in the letters to the editor column next issue after a few changes so that it looks like a letter.

The most important article was the Atlantic Fact article. I might explain a few changes. Used the lead paragraph. I thought after that that the order was not very good. Don read it after I did and told me he did not understand what took place. The two votes on the pact etc. Since this was the article of all of them that was a news article it had to clearly tell what took place. ~~XX~~ The big thing lacking in it was a report of what the opposition had to say, who they were etc. I know that the session was closed and possibly Charlie and Byron were not able to keep track of the situation. The Militant came in with that statement by the US Representative and I thought that this was much better material to slip in to expose the pact than what we ourselves have to say. Byron wrote ~~XX~~ us quite a report and we used a few highlights in the re-written article that he supplied. They gave added snap to the article.

I hope that this criticism does not seem to be too harsh. On the whole I think the comrades did an excellent job. Perhaps some of the changes were not even justified. But after you make a few fundamental ones the articles have a new logic of their own and there are serious limitations in what you can use from the originals. I think that the comrade who wrote the one on the Pact should watch his structure... should reread You Can Write for Labor Challenge. It is very good on this. The others there is little to say from a literary point of view. They were done over woven into others changed about for reasons of typography and for reasons political.

I certainly hope that this is the beginning of our getting more material. When there is not so much material and your plans are not so elaborate I should be able to go over the said article with the comrade who wrote it to both our benefits...and not be forced to leave this material as I am. I would like very much to hear what you think of the above remarks. I am sure we can have a very profitable discussion.

with warmest regards

Ross

May 17, 1949

Vancouver

Dear Reg; *Bullock*

From a letter I received from Idl the other day I gather we are in for a bit of a tussle over the last issue of the paper. She must have received my letter explaining the changes just after she mailed hers. It is sure a hot one. Of course I can understand a certain anger. No doubt the comrades really sweated over all the copy that they sent in. After thinking things over I am inclined to believe that it might be a good idea to discuss some of the points raised in my letter in the branch. I had previously suggested to Idl that the comrades involved get together but the problem is in large part a political one and I think might prove to be very good for the branch as a whole.

Idl gives me no inkling of what the trouble is but from going through the material I am inclined to believe that there is possibly a lack of clarity on our orientation to the CCF. All the articles were directed against Coldwell - Lewis, none made an attempt to analyze the opposition's position or to make any differentiation within the opposition. In fact the articles had an element of glorification of the opposition as something serious principled and as having led a good fight. And when they did talk about the opposition there was a certain fatalism, inevitability in them that somehow this hodge-podge would take the path of Marxism. I was amazed to note that MacInnis was passed off as opposing the Pact.

Possibly the question of CCF orientation is going to be raised in the branch in another way also...via the letter on the coming elections and our role. ~~YEM~~ I make the remark in that letter that the N.O. is of the opinion that there would be an element of ultra-leftism in our running a candidate in Vancouver which we could only do by challenging the CCF. I am absolutely opposed to our challenging a CCF candidate in Vancouver....that is at this stage in our development. It would only be understood by the workers to be splitting the vote and running against the CCF. We are not sufficiently known to justify our running against the CCF, above all in Vancouver. We could do it in Toronto where the workers through our municipal campaigns look upon us as a force. We could run one candidate since the CCF is running for all the other seats. Even then we would have to go through a series of publicized moves of asking the CCF since we represent a bona fide tendency and force in the political arena to withdraw in one seat. Of course they wouldn't do so but in the eyes of the workers the responsibility would be on the CCF's shoulders. But in Vancouver we could not carry out such a move as we are as yet unknown, and to the workers apparently without any influence whatsoever. Lenin has a good deal to say on this question in Left Wing Communism in a chapter on Left Wing Communism in Great Britain. Here of course he discusses tendencies in the English CP and its relationship to the Labor Party. In my opinion they are applicable to-day to the situation that is developing in Canada.

One of the more prominent comrades in the Toronto branch takes the stand that we must support Buck against the CCF in the Trinity riding here in Toronto. I have written a short article for the internal bulletin taking up this question, in passing explaining our position of critical support. In the same bulletin we will be carrying an article on the theory and tactic of entry, its purposes, our experiences etc. Nine pages of the bulletin are finally mimeographed and I am fairly sure at last the we can get it out this coming week-end before the next issue of the paper. It should be a good educational bulletin for the party. The bulk of it deals with the CCF orientation.

Incidentally I would still like to get an evaluation of our experience with Tom and Lloyd. I wonder if you could check up on whoever was doing this. If they get it out in the next few days it could still make this bulletin and I don't know when we will be getting out another. Would you take a note to phone Bill...he had the job didn't he .

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ I meant to write you before about the article that you submitted for L.C. and was published in the April issue. The only cuts I made were for reasons of space, the last two paragraphs. I had to do it as you had not set your margins on the typewriter at the right places. Your lines averaged about 70. Copy is supposed to be typed up with a 60 line. It looked alright to me when I received it and marked it up. I never thought to count the characters. But when we came to place the lead into the frame it was much too long, so I had to take the hatchet on it. Would you check that in the future.

I am enclosing a letter from a fellow in Nanaimo who appears to be a very good type. There is really nothing in it for me to answer but it would be worthwhile one of the Vancouver comrades using it to make a contact. I seem to recall that Tom dropped in on him once. Probably you know that fellow anyway so I am leaving it in your hands. He sent a letter to the editor which I commended with his approval.

Don received quite a long letter from Stan the other day, explaining his differences and troubles. In it he gave us the exact quote of that remark that Lloyd made when talking on political action...that he would oppose the IPP and RWP coming into the union etc etc. It is even worse than I thought it was previously. I think we should seriously consider the ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ possible necessity of our making it publicly known that he is no longer one of us, and Tom too. ~~XXX~~ I don't visualize our having to denounce him from the heavens but if he makes many more bad public moves it may be well to have an article on the IWA in which in passing we will attack him. You mention that there will possibly be a show down at the May 10th meeting. Perhaps this is the occasion for the article. We are having an editorial board meeting in the next few days and the dead dead line will probably be copy here on May 30th.

Hope we can do a job on the sub work. I know forces are one of our problems there but the caliber of those we have is good. I am sure that Ruth Lal and Ellaline are top door to door workers. We are not getting many on the jobs. Toronto has far less contact in industry than Vancouver. The other day one of our younger comrades, a university student got 12 on a Saturday afternoon of door to door work. The new comrades have been going out and have done fairly well so far. Getting three and four each rally. Montreal is sneezing in a few, a few have arrived from Windsor and we have about 75-80 from Toronto so far. Will be sending out a report shortly.

Taking in another comrade tonight. That makes five new members in the past 1 1/2 months. From our election work. That just about cleans out our contacts for a while until we can latch onto these new comrades' contacts and friends.

I would be interested in knowing what Bill thought we could have done and we did not do at the CCF convention. As a matter of fact one thing that puzzled me was the complete silence about the whole development and then the sudden flurry that the paper has to come out in an extra number or at least right away, give over the front page etc. I gathered from Byron's report that both he and Charlie were a bit lost in the whole to do. We need someone in there who is politically developed, alert, etc.

From what I can see it is not possible to spare anyone of the comrades we have right now for faction work in the CCF. 99% are marked Trotskyists. We need everyone in order to function even on the present plane. However I think that we must keep the idea of sending comrades into the CCF in mind. Last month I received a letter from Vic Bystrom that he was just about cleaned up at Streamstown and would be pulling

out for Vancouver shortly. He seems to me to be just the candidate...to go into the CCF. He is not known. He is an intelligent fellow, Quite an advanced comrades. Has he arrived there yet? If he hasn't how would you like to drop him a line. He was not too fussy about leaving all his freinds and contacts at Streamstown and it is just possible he may get bogged down again. A letter from you would do the trick. He has not corresponded with me for almost a month, since that letter.

His address is Vic Bystrom, Streamstown, Alberta.

He is just waht we need in Vancouver. He impressed me as having a very good political knowledge. No organizational expereicns although he picked up a little this winter amongst the oil workers. He will be a real addition to the branch. As a matter of fact I am tempted to try to switch him down here.

Have nothing much to say on Charlies experiences in the IWA. It seems to me that we have and are doing about all we can do. Hope that it doesn't hit cHarlies too hard. intimidate him or m ke him think he has nothing on the ball. He is a hell of a good type.

By the wya I ahvent seen any Vancouver minutes for months. How is the class etc.

Will write more shortly

Warmest regards

Ross

May 17, 1949

Same to Whelan

Dear Comrade Bradley:

Last month a trial committee struck off by the National Committee and composed of A. Macphese, E. MacDonald, and R. Bullock, held a special meeting at which 6 charges were laid against you.

After hearing the charges the committee recommended that you be suspended from membership in the party pending a decision of the next National Convention.

The National Committee has received all the documentation on the case and has been informed that after due notification you did not attend or notify any of the above of your inability to attend.

The N.C. accepts the recommendation of the trial committee and has now made its decision to suspend you from the branch of which you were a member and the National Committee to which you were elected by the national membership.

You of course will understand that you can appeal the suspension at the coming 11 National Convention of the party.

fraternally

Ross Dowson
for the N.C.

June 16, 1949

Vancouver
Dear Bill; *Whitney*

Enclosed you will find a short note replying to your "personal" letter of criticism which was read to the branch, approved by them and has become a statement by the branch on the May issue of the paper.

I have read it through very closely Bill and I must say am somewhat appalled by its tone and several remarks that weave through it. First the whole letter has an air of intolerance about it, sharpness ~~caustic~~ causticness which I do not think is at all called for and at all of benefit to the branch or the party.

"Actually there is nothing in the paragraph which contributes anything to a discussion..."

"I am indeed suprised at the rubbish you write in the fifth paragraph..."

"The articles printed by Ross would appear to be an expression of a lack of confidence in us and in our party.""

"the delay in getting out the paper was just as big a blunder as the poor material"

"Dowsons call for a convention of the CCF to settle the problems of the Atlantic Pact is a stupid political blunder.."

I dont know what you think of me and what the above in your use of the English language means to you but any worker in the party hearing these remarks can only conclude that the Vancouver branch secretary thinks that the National Secretary of the party is a "stupid political blunderer" that he lacks confidence not only in the second ~~of the~~ party of which he is the national secretary but that he has no confidence in the party ~~as a whole~~ whose national secretary he is. ~~That the editor of the official organ of the party is a writer of rubbish etc etc.....~~

~~XXXXX~~ I do not make any cliams to being a paragon of virtue or to being a political genius. I dont claim to be infalible, far from it. But I do believe that I am honest in my opinions, that I give the best that is in me to the movement. And I do not believe that anyone has the right to make ~~me~~ in my opinion slanderous remarks ~~about me~~, and I do not claim this only for myself. I do not think that anyone can say the above of anyone in our movement. I am absolutely opposed to such an atmosphere in the party that such remarks inevitably must generate. The party cannot exist as a party, cannot work together as a party under such an atmosphere.

I and no doubt you also have heard such remarks bandied about in the revolutionary movement before when a group was carrying an all out fight against another group convinced that this other group was dangerous and treacherous ~~group~~ had to called up shorts to a halt or driven out of the party. I do not believe that you think that such a situation exists in the rwp at this time

What makes the remarks most unfortunate is that they have all the element of slander. You say that the convention call is a "stupid political blunder." and that is all...with no attempt to develop a prove or anything else. You charge me with lack of confidence in the party with the added sentence of explanation..."the articles set a tone of teaching us and not encouraging a left wing growth in the CCF."

If this were only an isolated incident I certainly would not think of writing this letter, as a matter of fact it has taken me some time to write it as it is...but I have noticed this tendency in many other minor disputes that have cropped up. The fact that the differences have always been so small and generally unimportant makes me marvel at their tone. I would not think of writing this letter either if the correspondence was only between you and I for after all one becomes accustomed to on another's idiosyncracies. But it never seems to fail that these "personal notes" go before the branch. They thereupon cease to be personal but become the property of the branch.

I am afraid that such sharp formulations can only disorient newer comrades and create a terrible barrier of distrust between the Vancouver branch and the National Office.

You once made the remark to me that we have not yet built the leadership of the Canadian revolution. And I think that this is indisputably true. To my mind this only requires that the pinch hitters now attempting to build the movement and create this leadership must develop a wide tolerance of one another, allow for one another's weaknesses if they feel that such weaknesses exist. That the provisional leaders boost one another up bend over backwards to understand one another etc.

I know that we have not resolved the differences that have cropped up over the May issue. I don't know how we are going to either. As I am convinced that I handled the material correctly and you are convinced otherwise. I am afraid that ~~there is no way out of this~~ we will have to let the matter pass by. Perhaps later we will see it in a new and more correct light.

By the way I have informed the N.C. members of the details of McAuslan's offers. I should know their opinions by the first of next week at the latest and will let you know as soon as possible.

Say was it you or Reg who promised to write up a contribution to the bulletin on the Whalen-Bradely experience. What has happened to it. I am quite anxious to get hold of it as we have not yet informed the branches of this development and we cannot delay it much longer. I would prefer to make the announcement with the lessons of the experience.

comradely

Koss

*I would appreciate it if you would
Keep this note purely personal - between only you and me*

June 16, 1949

To the Vancouver Branch;
Dear Comrades;

We have received the minutes of your May 19th meeting and a copy of comrade Whitney's letter which was the basis of the discussion in the branch on the May issue of the paper.

I have read both over carefully together with the issue of L.C. in question and I cannot see that your "charges" are justified. Aside from the sharpness of your criticism which in some ways I can appreciate in view of the work done in preparing the material but which I ~~believe~~ still has no place in our relationship, I think your criticism flows from a lack of appreciation of the difficulties in putting out the paper and ~~on the part of the editorial board and the political board.~~
some rather heavy and mistaken political observations

First I would like to say that I do not by any means hold with the idea that everything that was done in the May issue of the paper was absolutely right and that there is no basis whatsoever for criticism. But I do believe that essentially the treatment of the CCF convention was correct.

I do not believe that "Dowson's call for a convention of the CCF to settle the problems of the Atlantic Pact is ~~simply~~ a stupid political blunder-also a remark on the call for a General Strike on the Asbestos situation is incorrect in a front page feature article."

I am of the opinion that the call for a convention was a wholly logical demand to raise. Coldwell announced that the CCFs position of support of the pact was determined by the so called "fact" that the majority of the CCF supported the pact. Young capitulated to Coldwell on the basis of this argument. That the majority position was support of the pact therefore he would have to support it. ~~But the majority position against the pact is the convention and it was shown that there was no question of a convention. The material was addressed to CCFers.~~ The claim of Coldwell has a powerful appeal to CCFers to accept the fact that "we fought against the pact but we were not able to swing the majority, we are loyal CCFers so we will have to abide by the majority stand". We Trotskyists would never accept such a position. We would vote against the pact regardless, for here a fundamental principle is involved. But for loyal CCFers, whose opposition is ~~not~~ not ~~in~~ at all a marxist one the idea that the majority supports the pact the reaction is something like this. "Well We have done all we can do in our section, the fight can go no further!" We Trotskyists want to carry the fight further though in other sections of the CCF. This fight can be a rallying point. We also want to encourage the idea that we should defy Coldwell ~~and~~ after all he is a liar..the majority dont support the pact...he said they did before ~~the~~ the B.C convention and see. Besides we know there is opposition in Ontario and Manitoba. If you dont issue a call for a convention the fight is stalled. We want to carry it further, we want to expose more clearly the Coldwell bureaucracy. A convention call in my opinion could be a rallying point for the opposition and would raise the question of the oppositions need to clarify its ~~oppositional~~ political position. Unfortunately the elections have stymied any moved towards this however Byron Johnson reports that 5 of his

club members have agreed that an immediate start must be made after the election to canvass all clubs in B.C. for support of an anti-war program against the leadership of the CCF. Why not all clubs in the country.... why not call for a convention to decide this question of all questions..war? If this takes hold this can bring about the organization of a national opposition and it would certainly pose all over again the question of what the anti-war program must be.

On the Asbestos article...what makes it incorrect in a front page feature article to call for work stoppages, downing of tools in demonstration of solidarity with the Asbestos strikers by Montreal and Quebec City workers?? I know that our coverage has not been very good on the Asbestos strike either but comrades, this is one of the greatest strike struggles in Canadian labor history and has won a powerful sympathy from the Quebec workers...so much so that even the church was compelled to take collections at the church doors. A few weeks after our article appeared ~~NYAN~~ Toronto papers carried big headlines that the Syndicate leaders, as conservative as they are, were threatening to call a general strike of all syndicate workers...not just stoppages and demonstrations as the L.C. article called for.

You say that "this paper is not designed to crystallize the opposition. Paul Kanes article does not give a sympathetic encouragement to the left development in the CCF. ~~Remarks drawn from the resolution of the CCF which says that the CCF is not a party but a movement and that it is not a party but a movement and that it is not a party but a movement~~ The pressure has been tremendous from all directions and the confusion has not been clarified by our articles but led to further confusion and bewilderment."

So you think that the paper was not friendly enough to the opposition in its criticism. I wish you were more concrete. I have reread all the material and I am afraid I cannot agree with you. You know in the April issue we even went so far as to give precious space to the publication of some of their absolutely incorrect, absolutely false resolutions. We threw the pages of the paper open to the opposition...and what a miserable opposition it was. I do not know how one could be more friendly than to offer to use our money to publish material which we don't approve of. And the May issue. Yes it is sharper but I think quite correctly so. But I think that it is still friendly. We called the action of the opposition "inspiring." We said that "they bravely withstood Lewis' attacks" etc etc. True we then grab them by the shoulders and shake them telling them what they could really have done with the marvellous opportunity they had. We tell them they have got to really smarten up, that they have to take a revolutionary marxist position on war. And I think this was our duty. We want to encourage the development of a left wing..but we want it to be a genuine left wing. A left wing that looks for leadership from persons who say one thing in the convention and the same thing in the House. ..who are principled and marxist. ..we want to give it the Trotskyist program.

~~I would like to know precisely how this article have not clarified the situation but have led to further confusion and bewilderment. I don't see it at all.~~

I note in the minutes some comments on the need of the paper to "center on local and domestic working class affairs as we build the party out of the daily struggles of the Canadian workers, and if the paper does not do this properly then it cripples our work." I gather that this is an addition to Bills astonishment that we cut some of the CCF material out

of the paper in favour of other material. Actually comrades if you measure the material in the ~~XXXX~~ issue you will find that there was practically nothing cut. Almost one full page of a four page paper is devoted to the CCF convention. Over half of a full page dealt with the B.C. CCF in the April issue. And there was almost 1/2 a page in the March issue. The one item that was cut out and should have been in was the sales tax article. I can only repeat that it was set up and was to go in but we were confronted with a situation at the print shop which required us to drop that amount of copy and there was no way we could get around it.

I did not go into the details because I thought that you would accept my explanation. But this was the situation. Pages one and four were already printed. Page two was laid out and locked up. When we came to ~~page~~ page three we found that we had the exact amount of type that was in the sales tax article left over. If we did not pull it we would have had to pull something else. But everything else was much bigger and if pulled would have left gaps. At that time the pressman is waiting for the inside pages and he has just enough time if we work fast to get it off that night. If he doesn't we won't get the paper until Monday instead of Friday. Incidentally the paper came off the Friday, was mailed that night and I can't understand why you did not receive it by the 11th instead of as Bill reports a full week later.

I see that you are "greatly annoyed at the May Day article ~~xxx~~ which should have been the April issue. The Chinese article could have been covered in one half the space."

I do not see how we could carry a May Day article in an April issue which comes off on about April 9th or 10th. You will find if you check in other labor monthlies that they traditionally carry the May Day article in the May issue. I myself had not looked upon the May Day manifesto as a call to action on May Day but a statement of party policy on what we think to be the basic issues confronting labor at this time. I wish that the Chinese article could have been covered in one half the space. I tried my best to cut it shorter but found that I was unable to do so without destroying its political sense. The editorial board has made it a practice of trying to carry in whole official documents from the IS and sections of the Fourth. We did manage to cut several inches from it as it appeared in the Militant but I did not think that it could stand further cutting.

I detect in Bill's article and in the minutes of the branch a tendency to believe that the opinions of the Vancouver branch and the comrades who were carrying on the correspondence over this issue are resented by myself and blandly ignored. This is not at all true comrades. The editorial board composed of the comrades who write for the paper has heard all of your criticisms and suggestions. When your material began to arrive on the CCF convention it was shown to the various comrades available ~~xxxx~~ including Don and the shifts and changes were made only following considerable discussion with these comrades and with ~~xxxx~~, I think I can say, their general approval.

comradely

Ross Dowson

An afterthought on the character of the articles that were submitted for the May issue;

In my last letter I characterized the articles as having a centrist character. I would possibly have been more correct to have said that they were news articles and stopped there. This is what gave them the centrist character, that they contented themselves with merely giving the news of the convention, comments of the various speakers, the most left of whom reported were mere centrists.

I have taken a look over the sales tax article which we published in the last issue as a letter, sticking on a lead from a recent note we received from Byron Johnson.

While this is the best article I think even it shows the weaknesses of the others and since we can all read it it would be worth while to go over it.

It is a good news report of the positions taken by the various delegates on this question. But none of the delegates including Strachan and O'Brien took the line that we would have taken and in fact I am sure to the ordinary workers Winch and Gargrave's arguments have a validity. The mass of the workers including many who call themselves socialists are not concerned with the purity of socialism and socialist theory. They quite readily accept the idea that "you have to be practical" that theory is alright but that it is quite a long way divorced from practice. Gargrave's line is the line being ~~advanced~~ advanced by the British labor bureaucrats. And the English working class true with opposition from some quarters are by and large accepting this line.

It is a good news report. It devotes as much space to present the Winch/Gargrave position as it does the oppositions. And to my mind it presents both rather impartially. I don't think Gargrave would take exception to the article at all. After giving Gargrave and Winch full coverage for their poisonous ideas, ideas which are very effective, we end up with a small comment of our own ~~line~~ *line, and one that doesn't deal with the issue at dispute* only in so far as it says quite correctly that Gargrave practices with some of the conditions.

First it takes too much for granted on the ability of our readers to take a correct stand...I am sure many readers would lift up their heads after reading that letter saying..Yes it sure is a tough spot socialists are in, what is the relationship of theory and practice, the theory of O'Brien is good but but..... The article is not a vehicle for our ideas but for the ideas of the centrists and the Winch gang.

We never carry straight news articles of that type in our paper. There is no paper in the world more heavily editorialized than ours. The only type of article we don't editorialize are articles that don't need it. That deal with simple class against class issues like the Billionaire's club just above the letter.

June 22, 1949

Dear Reg;

Bullock

McKee, VAN

Bill Whitney

-more Zedard, etc

Received a letter from Angus this morning, a wire from Jean yesterday and a note from Murray the day previous. All have cast their vote yes to the motion that we support the CCF in all ridings including Trinity and Cartier. Jean says yes temporarily, he is not yet completely satisfied. On the question of Whitney; Murray says he "must follow" my lead as he is not sufficiently familiar with Whitney and the situation in the Vancouver branch. Jean has not answered yet. I gather that Angus has written you his opinion.

I do not see how the N.C. can take a stand on the question. I think that it is up to the branch, mainly you and Whitney. Are Lil and Bill going to make a real gap in the branch? Well in numbers they certainly are and this is quite important psychologically when we are so small. Politically well I am not sure what the effect will be. I do not know Bill any too well. But my impression is that he lives a considerable extent in the past. That he isn't a builder but has a tendency to be a political gossipier, small talker. I do not believe that his influence in the branch is many times any too beneficial. He is a very fine comrade but in one or two of the discussions that took place while I was there I was not too favourably impressed by his political role. He seems to take an intransigent position on very petty questions, he seems to take pleasure in creating and generating very sharp situations. One thing however did strike me about Bill and that was his unquestioning devotion to the party, the ~~party~~ concentration of his interest. You know best what Bill contributes in the concrete to the branch. You know best what his withdrawal and let us not forget Lil, will do. Certainly Court will develop, so will MacDonald if he is there but we must recognize that several other comrades, good as they are, have very definite limitations. How much work does Bill do, will Court and Jack rise to the occasion, will their place be taken up, or will more work be thrust on yours and Ruth's shoulders. What will come out of the job is hard to say. Lil is an aggressive type, possibly the two of them will turn up something really worthwhile, but here again comes in your evaluation of Bill. Of course he can always quite if we find that his withdrawal is cutting us out from doing essential work. Bill says in his letter to me that he "is bound to be influenced by the greatest bunch of self seekers and bureaucrats the Naobr movement has had in history when isolated from my party and its discussions." What do you think of this danger? So....I am inclined to believe that it is in your hands. I tend to lean a little to the side of opposing it. Sorry I can't be of more help.

I haven't all the trade union reports before me so will say nothing about them. Jean was in a week or so ago and I loaned them to him. Murray said he was returning them but they weren't enclosed.

I received the lengthy letter from Bill and endorsed by the branch on the changes made in the articles dealing with the B.C. CCF convention. Sent a reply which you have no doubt heard by now. At the same time I sent a personal note to Bill. This second letter I sent only after a great deal of hesitation, and I am still not too satisfied that it was the right thing to do. The note was a personal note and I asked him to keep it that way. It is a protest against the very sharp and cautious formulations that appear in the letter he sent.

It seems to me that all that letter could do in the minds of Frank, Charlie etc create the same old feeling of distrust hostility that Lloyd and Tom thrived on. "Dowsons call for a convention of the CCF to settle the problems of the Atlantic Pact is a stupid political blunder,....The articles printed by Ross would appear to be an expression of a lack of ~~XXXX~~ confidence in us and in our party.....I am indeed suprised at the rubbish you write in the fifth paragraph." I dont know what you think but in my opinion that crap has be out out. Disagreements, fine ! But this stuff is political poison. I dont think we can permit such a thing in the party. I tried to write it as freindly as I possibly could. I hope Bill takes it easy. Has he said anything to you about this letter?

~~XX~~

Thanks for the information on the Winch-Cameron feud. Interesting but waht is it all about, what are the differences? Is it purely personal or are there any shadows of political differences. Byron in his last letter said he was convinced that there was a fight going on in the top leadership but he did not know what it was about. I sent him the O'Brein information. In his last letter he says that

"The program you outlined (in LC I guess) for the opposition work is correct. Our club members, five of them out of 27 are very decided, came to the same conclusions.. One member said he would pay for the printing of material we propose to send to all clubs in B.C. We insist that our provincial M.P.'s and M.L.A.'s must support the majority decision of our Provincial Convention. We also will press for a referendum of B.C. members on war or peace which will bring the Marshall Plan and Atlantic Pact before the rank and file for their decision. It is proposed we make this our first task after the election. If the CCF NEWS refuses to print our appeals I feel hopefull that our members would be glad to seek publicity in LABOR CHALLENGE."

I wrote him a lengthy reply last night. I am afraid he might stick himself and ~~XXX~~ his supporters out on a limb. The CCF NEWS will never print any of their appeals. To publish it in Labor Challenge would be to have a split perspective. They almost tossed Byron out this spring and if he swings a sizeable bloc of the club over and openly challenges the leadership without support arranged beforehand in other clubs why they will give him the gogng. I have suggested to him that we must work more cautiously and attempt to contact other dissidents first. I have suggested the idea of their publishing a mimeographed paper, containing club news and articles on important issues which they should attempt to circulate amongst other clubs. I have also urged that he contact you and through you establish relations with Stanley Park, Rod Young, O'Brein, the list of names that Young has, other clubs etc. If Sooke cant publish a paper perhpas Stanley Park will revive The Flame....and we feed our material into it. Above all I have pointed out we want to find an avenue of approach to this broad amorphous opposition revealed at the Convention. We can approach it from the outside with Labor Challenge and from the inside with Flame. What can we do on this score....I gather O'Brein is quite friendly, will he work with us? We are not ~~XXXXXXXX~~ some Simon pures..just some openings.

Havent heard about Lang's trip as yet. Last time it appeared in the SWP B.C. minutes. If there is nothing in the next set I will write and foind out.

I have again raised the question of the writing up of our experiences

with L and T with Bill. I thought he had promised to take this task on. I would like to get it shortly so we could get out another bulletin and properly inform the party of their expulsion. Could you give Bill a push or give him a hand with it.

What did you think of the last bulletin. Have so far received comments only from Murray. What was the reaction to the Barry Brent article on the tactic of entry. I thought it was a good educational move. Has there been any discussion in the branch on the various contributions. I think it would be a good idea to have some educationals on some of the material. Dont worry about the Joe Rose contribution. It doesnt represent anything in the Toronto branch just one of the costs of democracy.

We cut the Toronto campaign off on schedule, reached the 240 Odd mark. We are now concentrating all our efforts in trying to contact the CCF, see what is going on, the advisability of sending some comrades in etc. One of the comrades has joined the CCYM with branch approval. Elsewhere not as favorable as we could wish. Will give a full report when the campaign has wound to a close. Very anxious to hear about Vancouver experiences in the campaign. We held a bang-up street corner meeting in the Spadina riding last Saturday night. Sold 49 copies of the paper. Put across our line to many interested Stalinists. We are holding another tomorrow night. In the meantime all the comrades able are going to CCF committee rooms helping in the CCF campaign etc. Have heard nothing from Montreal on my suggestion that they should get into the Cartier or Verdun campaign. I know Windsor is working along this line but probably wont hear all about it until the two comrades come into Toronto this coming holiday week-end.

No further information on conciliationism to Stalinists in the British section.

Very much interested in getting all the dope on Morrison's speech on the Trotskyists. Have some good ideas as to how we can very effectively use it. Would you ask Ruth to send us it in great detail. Not sure that we will use it for this issue of the paper but she might as well send it in on time anyway. May use it in the Trotsky memorial article in the next issue.

We have not yet had the editorial meeting for the July issue. We of course be going to press after the election returns are in so we can carry all the election material in the July issue and not clutter up August. Havent had a chance to think over how we should handle it. But we should certainly devote some space on the failure of the CCF to make any gains in B.C. There has been little in the press here on it aside from the Red Flag episode and the Coldwell Steeves panic. But that seems to be well worth something itself. The deadline will probably be July 4th. That will give us time to do some serious thinking over the 27th returns. Will you be able to send anything in

Certainly want to hear what you have to say about the provincial elections anyway so we can write the general evaluation of the elections and what they mean.

comradely

Ross

June 23, 1949 ✓

Bullock, Van
Dear Ruth;

I have been meaning to write you for a few weeks now. I hope that Bill turned the receipts for the sub money you have been sending in. So far we have received 58 subs and the correct amount of money.

I gather that sub work has been more difficult this year than previously. Old man Bullock was moaning in one of his letters about how tough he has been having it...how he meets all the dough heads. By and large we have found it about the same as last year. Of course the odd night we do very badly, seem to find no one home, or meet uninterested housewives, but it has averaged out about the same. Don B ended up third highest with about 20 subs to his credit. About half of those Don got through going to houses carrying vote CCF signs. We closed off on the 15th so that all the comrades would be available to make contact with the CCF during the campaign in its last weeks.

Of course sub work should be better in the midst of a general election. But we have found that the CCF has failed utterly to inspire anyone including its own ranks. We did not meet many Stalinists this year but a very high proportion of our Toronto subs are CCFers (club members or trade union PAC activists.)

How long are you going to carry the Vancouver campaign. I gathered from one of your letters that you were unable to get underway until about the 23rd of May. Are you going to carry on for the full month and a half?...or is everyone getting played out by all the rallies by now? Would you let me know as soon as you wind it up so we can send a final report to all the comrades.

No doubt Reg has told you that Toronto is attempting to make some real contact with the CCF. In a few more weeks I think it would be a good idea if we managed to get all our experiences together. I gather from a couple of hints that you have had some very valuable ones. How would you like to sit down some evening and write them up. Possibly we will be able to get out another internal bulletin in a month or so and we could publish some of your experiences for the information of the party.

Reg ~~Edwards~~ dropped a few lines about Bob Morrison's attack on poor innocent us. I am very anxious to get all. Would you send us all the you can remember. It would make a good lead for an article on what is Trotskyism in the Trotsky memorial August issue. We could use it for several purposes. Hope you haven't forgotten the details

How are your shakes piling up. Are we making any progress with the house plans or is that coming with the revolution. And your daughter...if she was down here we would have in the party. I'm getting to be the old man.

with warmest regards

June 23, 1949 /

To the Vancouver branch

Dear Comrades;

Comrade Whitney has informed us that you have requested the National Committee to make a decision on the matter of his accepting the post of a functionary in the trade union movement.

I have reported to the National Committee all the circumstances in the case. The National Committee does not feel that it is able to make a definite decision on a matter such as this and that the decision properly falls on the shoulders of the branch which will most immediately be effected by it.

In making the decision we hope that the branch will pay due attention to the possible effect that the withdrawal of the two experienced comrades involved will have on its activities.

fraternally

Ross Dowson

June 30, 1949

Bill White
Brtiannia

Dear Comrade Bill;

It was good to hear from you after such a long silence. Hope that you can manage to keep in touch with us more often in the future. Letters from the comrades in the field are one of the few ways of our keeping in touch with developments in the Canadian labor movement. Otherwise we are forced to rely on the press of the Stalinists ~~and~~ CCF the bureaucrats or the bosses. for our information.

You know our present lack of roots in the mass movement, our smallness and geographical lopsidedness always present a threat to our future development. And everyone of you comrades in the mass movement are like precious jewels to us.

I was particlaurly glad to get the information on the Mine Mill. From all reports down here the Mine Mill is on its last legs. There have been several votes in different mines in the Sudbury areas and the CCL has taken them hands down. The CCL bureaucrats justify their bureaucratic actions against the Stalinists with the argument that Mine Mill never ever really organized Northern Ontario. Now the CCL claims to be making great headway. And it is obvious that despite the fact that the Stalinists are the official leadership of the Mine Mill, despite the general organizational conservatism of the workers which would also tend to make them stand by Mine Mill the workers are not doing so at all. It seems to me that it would be wrong to think of the Stalinist defeat as reflecting the victory of red baiting or right wing elements. o a large extent I think it is the crimes of the Stalinists catching up with them; The workers just dont seem to give a damn what happens to the Stalinists, and I am sure this includes many militants.

Mine Mill had a very militant and quite large local out at Long Branch a Toronto suburb, Annaconda Copper and Brass. Apparently there has been a battle going on in the local for some time. It was suddenly revealed last fortnight that the entire executive wanted to switch to Steel. The executive was violently opposed by the organizer a Bernard Doherty who heretofore appeared to be an independent militant with certain CCF tendencies. The executie started to take a vote of the workers in the plant. It seems they got it underway and its was going all out for Steel when Doherty got an injunction against the vote. Last week Doherty ~~ERECT~~ let off a blast against the CCF and the CCL bureaucracy--Stalinist line.

The CCL is moving in on Hollinger trying to take over from Mine Mill. It seems that the AFL electricians are trying to take advantage of the fight to carve out the electricians for themselves. The CCL is protesting to the Labor Board against the AFL coming in and breaking up the industrial basis of the unionization in that mine. Doherty appeared at the Board supporting the right of the Mine AFL electricians to muscle in. It looks like they are giving up there too and would like to see anything go if they cant hold on.

You say that there is an opposition at Bralorne that has taken over. It appears to be completely reactionary. There is a report in the latest issue of Finan cial Post hailing an agreeemt that the Bralorne Mine Mill signed with Bralorne Mills The Post calls it unique. The union settled without a raise. and also signed up for

an efficiency bonus plan based on the cost of production "When production costs go below a certain base figure the bonus is increased, if cost rise above the base the bonus goes down." The contract is for three, three, years.

The B.C. district executive board of Mine Mill has ruled Billingsley and McGhee who you mentioned are on the Liberal and Coalition slate ineligible as candidates for office in the recent elections. I gather they must have been elected to office but the Stalinists are ruling them ineligible on the basis that the Trail, Yellowknife and Wells locals were behind in their per capita payments to the international at the time of the elections. This report is in the latest issue of The Pacific Tribune and is at a slight variance from the report you heard "that they have refused so far to take office owing to pressure of business at home."

I am sure that the Kimberly opposition is not tied with the CCL leadership at least at this time anyway. The CCL which is really tied to the CCF would never countenance Byrne president at Kimberley running against the CCFer J. H. Mathews for the Coalition. Of course after the election issue cools down there would be nothing that would prevent these cynical bureaucrats from lining up with a guy like Byrne

I think that your general orientation, condemnation of the CCL-CIO bureaucrats and defence of the right of Mine Mill to run its own affairs, including the right to organize the hardrock industry. At the same time the actions of the Mine Mill leadership is right. There is no doubt that the Stalinists are able to cut a pseudo radical figure under the reactionary attack of the CCL bureaucrats. We are certainly opposed to both bureaucracies. However we are practically nonexistent as a force; yourself and three others. Can we even appear as a force before the workers in Brtannia. Arent the lines too sharply drawn between the workers who go along with the CCL and the workers who go along with Mine Mill. Isnt the fight too sharp, isnt everyone in reality having to take a stand with one or the other, despite his reservations? ~~IN ORDER TO DISCUSS TACTICS~~ In order to discuss tactics one has to know the precise situation and the accurate relationship of forces. Let us take for example the situation at Annaconda. Here is the executive and the membership supporting a switch to Steel. About the sole opposition appears to be the Mine Mill flunkies ~~AND~~ ~~THEY WOULD SEEM TO ME TO BE SUICIDE FOR US, TO CUT US OFF FROM~~ It would seem to me to be suicide for us, to cut us off from working with any effect amongst the workers if we remained lined up with Mine Mill in that situation. I think we would have to go along with Steel, retaining our independence, our criticism as clearly as we could.

I think it is necessary to attempt to assess the relationship of forces. Is Mine Mill through as it appears to be in many areas? Where are the militants? Are they with Mine Mill or is it just the party liners that Mine Mill has left. Are the militants apathetic to the CCL savagery and going along with it due in large party to disgust with the Stalinist Mine Mill leadership? Above all we want to stay with the militants.

Yes we have to retain our separate identity, our principled position but when you are a woefully weak force and unable to present an alternative you have to go along with one of the big forces, I dont mean by this that we have to ~~NEARLY~~ support them but that we just go along in order to keep us in contact with the workers, the militants so that we do carry on our work.

Just a few thought which we might discuss.

I suppose you are going into Vancouver every so often so that there is nothing to be gained by trying to give you the low-down.

By the way Bill what is the score with the CCF in Brtannia. I dont recall

ever hearing.

It seems obvious to me that there is going to be hell break out in the CCF very shortly and it would be well if where possible we were in there in order to crystallize the opposition that is in the process of developing.

Down East here the CCF leaders openly admit that the cause of the CCF defeat was the fear of the workers that Drew would get in and so they voted what appeared to be the only practical alternative for St Laurent. They neglect to say that this is the very advice that they themselves gave the workers. Coldwell told the workers that the CCF could only hope to be the opposition, that it would be a loyal one, that the Drew forces had to be defeated most of all and that the liberals were much the lesser evil. The guilt for the defeat properly belongs on the shoulders of Coldwell Lewis and company. When some of the comrades have put this across they have not a good reception from CCF workers. I am sure that Coldwell and co are in for a real opposition. Coldwell did not even bother to veil a threat that they would be carrying out a purge in the B.C. section. He tries to pass off the defeat on the B.C. section for its support of the Atlantic Pact. It seems to me that it is highly possible for us to play a big role in rallying opposition to the Lewis Coldwell opposition if we can manage to contact the B.C. left and help organize it. We can possibly come out with tremendous gains, although I don't visualize the work short term work at all.

It seems to me that since your are to all intent and purposes alone in Britannia that it would be profitable to get into the CCF. Even if the elements in it at this time are not at all too good. I have suggested to Reg that he approach the Stanley Park club to start THE FLAME again. Byron Johnson at Milnes Landing needs such a vehicle for his work. A paper like this can be the rallying point of the B.C. left wing. You could be its agent in Britannia. What is the situation.

We have decided to start to build a CCF caucus here in Toronto. Last week we struck off two comrades on the basis of information we obtained during the election work to enter two different clubs. Unfortunately we haven't many capable comrades or I should say suitable comrades from point of view of not being known well who we can spare for this work.

Held two very fine election meetings on street corners last week. Sold 40 copies of the paper at one and 70 at the other plus a few subs and a few pamphlets. There is great interest in our position on the CCF. Had hot discussions on the IPP and its election policy also.

I see it is ten after twelve so I better close off. Drop us a line as soon as possible. Can we make any switches on the books you borrowed. Have you finished them and can we send you some new ones.

comradely

Ross Dawson

Flame on
is made
2C on the
outside

July 12, 1949

Dear Reg;

Just a hurried up note, have yet some cleaning up to do after the paper, we haven't got the complete press run yet although we managed to get out the individual copies and 100 copies extra to Van last night.

Yesterday I received the CCF NEWS with Cameron's article in it. Suppose you have read it thoroughly, I have only had a chance to glance through it. Too bad we missed it in the paper.

What is the score with us in this terrific situation? Have we established contact with Cameron Young and Stanley Park. This looks to me like the biggest opportunity that has confronted us yet.

What is the left doing to organize itself, Has it held any meetings? Is it going to take over the CCF NEWS? What are we doing with Charlie and did we manage to put anyone else in the CCF in the last month.

What do you think of the advisability of a complete entry in Vancouver? Could we get in, would the left wing welcome us in order to prepare for the fight or would they be afraid of us. Can our forces stand up in an entry, do we know sufficient enough how to coordinate our forces. What do you think of the general moral, political understanding ability to work in a centrist milieu, of our forces.

Situations like this sometimes require drastic actions, in order to take advantage of them. Days and weeks count. ~~XXXXX~~Of course one must have a true assessment of your own forces. But in a situations like this ~~XXXXXX~~ ones own forces can gain years of experience and make contacts and progress that would normally take much time and effort.

I am convinced that this is not going to be a little flurry like we had on numerous other occasions. This is serious. When an electoral opportunist loses an election they stand exposed as no amount of theoretical exposure could ever do. Coldwell has the axe out.

I am sure that at least we can establish a real working arrangement which we could come out of with perhaps double and triple our forces. No one knows what path Cameron etc may be forced to take--break away and form an independent socialist B.C. party. If they do it is in my mind absolutely essential that we be in one the ground floor. Have you been in contact with Young since his return...he appears to me to be the avenue.

Have to meet an appointment. Will write again shortly.

warmest regards

Ross

July 20, 1949 ✓

Whitney, Van
Dear Bill;

It has been a long time since we have heard from you. How is everything going. I am putting my return address on this letter as I do not know whether you have taken the trade union post or not and whether you are still in town or not.

If you are in town no doubt you are busy trying to take advantage of the terrific developments within the CCF. That was quite a statement by Cameron in the CCF NEWS. It could only be understood as a declaration of war by the top leadership of the B.C. CCF against the Coldwell-Lewis gang. No doubt they are taking the offensive in order to line up their forces against Coldwell's threatened purge of the B.C. section. I see in the latest issue that it has roused a considerable rank and file support. in the letters to the editor column.

What has been happening within the CCF clubs? Is the B.C. leadership lining up the clubs? Is there any opposition to the left turn advocated by Cameron and obviously supported by the CCF News editorial board? It would seem to me that following a blast like Cameron's hell would break out in the various clubs and a sorting out take place. Cameron and coy by the logic of the situation are going to be compelled to attempt to give their forces some sort of organizational form and to attempt to propagandize them. It is of course possible that they may not go very far in their stupidity to do such a thing but ~~XXX~~ do it they must in some form and shape.

We should be able to really cash in on this development. It is an opportunity of a life time. What would normally take years of dogged work can at a time like this be achieved in weeks and months.

Possibly we can make an open approach to Cameron, Young and company. They may be desperate enough or they may consider us in such a friendly light that they would grasp at our proffered aid. This would mean that not only would the one or two comrades now in the CCF be able to really go to town but that our most able comrades would be able to either go into the CCF or work so close, coming in contact with rank and file militants that we would be able to make considerable gains. ~~XXX~~ We could build a Trotskyist caucus in the CCF.

Then again Cameron and coy may be terrified of becoming linked up with us for fear of Coldwell using it against them and refuse to have anything to do with us. In this case I think it would be advisable for the branch to seriously consider if it can possibly increase our CCF caucus members. I know that we are very few in number and find it difficult to carry on the party work we are presently doing but it would seem to me that the possibility of doing more effective work in the CCF outweighs what we are gaining in conducting our class at the Swedish Hall etc.

Have we comrades we could send into the CCF in the face of Cameron hostility? I know a considerable number of our comrades are marked men. This of course means the most experienced comrades. Have we any other comrades we could send in, comrades who are capable of carrying on this difficult kind of work, who can take close leadership and direction from the more experienced comrades? WORK of this type requires

a complete and firm understanding of our objective, an imperviousness to centrism and centrist tendencies, yet considerable adaptability.

I am making all these suggestions and remarks of course with out having any real or precise knowledge of what is taking place in the branch or the CCF. But one thing seems clear to me and that is that for the next period at least we must direct all our attention towards the CCF and not just most of our attention. I am quite anxious to hear from you. Have received no word from Vancouver for some period aside from a short note from Ruth winding up the sub campaign.

How did the comrades like the last issue of Labor Challenge? We are having the editorial board meeting for the next issue this Saturday. I am going to suggest that we reproduce Cameron's article with extensive comments. I would like any information that you can supply on the situation in the B.C. section, what is behind the statement, etc. ~~Should you be able to supply any more information on this matter?~~

I haven't heard yet from anyone what the reaction of the branch was to the internal bulletin that we put out a couple of months ago...with the article on the Entrist Tactic, What our position is towards the CCF etc. Was there any discussion in the branch on the material?

We mailed almost 400 copies of the last issue of the paper to B.C. We made up a list of names and addresses from the lists of contributors to the B.C. CCF election campaign that appeared in the CCF News. Unfortunately the only names we could use were those of persons living in small towns in B.C. that did not require street address. We enclosed an appeal for a sub. Will let you know the results. We should know in about a week or so. We did not have enough copies of the last issue to finish the list and intend to carry on with the next issue.

with warmest regards

Ross Dowson

July 21, 1949

Dear Frank;

I'm sorry to be so long in returning your receipt but I promised myself that I would return the receipt along with a short note and this is the first time that I have had a chance to get down at the typewriter.

You asked me to send you a tally of how the branch stood in regards to dues and pledges. I can't tell you how far you are behind as you ask because when I left you will recall we had a headquarters and had come to an agreement that for a period we would not expect Vancouver to keep up its regular pledge on top of the headquarters. But here is a tally of what we have received since January 1st.

January 10th	43.25	April 5	5.00 for IS
Feb 26	33.25	May 22	12.00 for IS
April 5	43.25	June 8	40.00

So if you want to know how far you are behind well; there is a gap in March, May and now July and at the monthly pledge of 43.25 totalling \$143.00

Sorry to hear that you have been in a bit of a rut for the past period, as human beings with all the weaknesses of our species I suppose we just have to tolerate such weaknesses in ourselves and as revolutionists I guess we have to fight as best we can against them. Perhaps bookkeeping doesn't go so well with you. If you are having any trouble why don't you ask one of the comrades for a little help. I am sure they would be glad to give you a hand.

You know branch treasurer is a key and therefore very flattering post in the party. Lenin always looked upon how money was coming into the center of the party as a barometer that told him the health of the party, its political understanding its confidence in itself etc. There is only one thing that this doesn't take into account and that is the ability of the treasurer. Is he on his toes, is he inspiring the comrades with the consciousness of the need to make sacrifices for the party, its press etc. is he efficient and so on.

I told Don that you liked his articles. You gave him quite a lift for he really works hard over them. I see the printer mucked up his last one a bit by transposing a line or two. I am sure he would like to hear from you first chance you get. He wrote Stan a month or so ago in reply to some of his ideas that he outlined. So far he has received no reply. Are you in touch with him. If I remember rightly Stan's leave of absence comes up at the end of August. It might be a good idea if a couple of you comrades dropped around to see him.

Don was working at Canada Packers where we have been trying to make a concentration for sometime now...up until this week. He quit however as he found he couldn't stand the shift work---difficult to get sleep. Right now he is looking around again. He is going to conduct our second series of classes that we have been holding this summer...it will be on the development of socialist thought. He spoke at one of our street corner meetings. We have held four so far. We have sold a good number of papers at them...averaging about 50 copies at each meeting. We have also sold a few pamphlets and picked up a few persons who appear to be interested but have to be worked on considerably yet.

with warmest regards

Ross

July 22, 1949 ✓

Bullock, Wm
Dear Ruth;

Hey! Who is this strange person whose thoroughly brutal philosophy would want you to kick your mother when she's down. I will have you know my dear that my mother looks upon me as a most loving son. Why she made her will out the other day and she has already told me that she has left me one of her most treasured heirlooms....a stupid little old chair... I smiled oh so gratefully.. how much will you bid me on the chair. She may be sick shortly and I will be able to pull it out from under her and send it on to you....for a price. You see, I am certainly a person of principle.

But I am not at all so bad, not at all as bad as you make out. There is an add that appears in some US magazines. A big hombre and a little whisp of a girl always figured in it and the line is TOUGH BUT OH SO GENTLE. That the real me. Tough but oh so gentle. I'm really a softy. I just put on the hard front as I dont want people to take advantage of old softy me.

But I am going to be hard on you for the data on the Bob Morrison incident. Really not too hard though. All I want is some precise details. Where the meeting took place, when, who Morrison is, and a couple of quotes as exact as you can make them. How about doing it now. If it is agreeable with the editorial board I want this little bit of easy to give us information for the next issue of the paper for use in the Trotsky memorial article. I would like it in the next couple of days if at all possible

Received the subs alright as you must have gathered from the circular letter winging up the drive. On the whole I think we did pretty good.

How about giving your husband a little hell when he comes in tonight. I want to hear from him. What is going on in the CCF. What we think we can do; what we are doing in order to cash in on this "revolt." Havent had any mimites for about two months. Possibly Bill is tied up with all the do about taking on the union job. Has he taken it yet. Perhaps these latest developments require us to keep him there in Vancouver.

Mrs McDonnell send us in a very nice donation. It was some money a freind of hers sent her (Paulkner's daughter at Ocean Falls) and she sent the whole sum on to us. along with a very flattering note "to the sustaining fund of your paper which is truly a wonderful Challenge to the workers." She also asked for a bundle of papers. that he and she could use for "potential converts". Have we done anything about these folks. Here is old softy me coming out again.

Tell the comrades that we have been doing our best the last while to keep the flag flying high down here. We have had four very successful street corner meetings. Must have averaged 50 copies of the paper sold at each meeting. Made a few contacts to work on and sold a few pamphlets. Don spoke at two of them and right now we have him working on our second series of classes. This one is going to be on the development of socialist thought. The last one was on the lessons and hisorty of the Russian Revolution. How have you liked the last few issues of the paper? And what did you think of the material in the internal bulletin that we finally managed to get out.

And above all I am anxious to here about the CCF revolt.

comradely

Ross

July 26, 1949 ✓

To N.C. members;

Last issue of Labor Challenge carried a report on recent developments in the British Labor Party and the publication of Socialist Outlook. Socialist Outlook is the product of the work of our British comrades who went into the LP some while back. Our comrades have two of the 5man editorial board. The paper is left centrist in character ~~XXX~~ and is gradually working into a clear position particularly in the Editorials. Comrade G. Healy who is the leader of the entrlist group in Britain says in his letter to us that "Our entry here has been very useful but there are many problems. It is the type of operation that needs a strong cadre who are politically clare and understand what they want. Sectarianism and opportunism have got to be eradicated and the group internally must as far as possible be homogeneous. So far we have been fortunate in having this type of group and consequently many growing pains have been eased." He says that he will keep us up to date with their experineces. He has sent us a complete file of the Socialist Outlook. The N.O. has taken out four subscriptions to this paper for P.R. Montreal ~~XXX~~ Vanc, Tor. in the belief that it will be valuable in the education of our cadres.

The Montreal comrades have informed us of recent developments with regards to their idea of forming a front organization...reported in the last letter. The situation is still in flux., but considerable contact work has been done. A meeting is being arranged for 27th July and will be attended by a representative of the Gagnon group(exLPP) who appear to be anxious to "make their way out of a propendan ~~XXXX~~ stage. But they don't ravor the idea of an educational league. They would rather see something more political." There will also be in attendance, an old time radical well known in Montreal anti-Stalinist circles, a CCF centrist, candidate in the last election, and one or two others.

During the federal elections the comrades attempted to make contact with the CCF. It appears that the CCF campaign was pretty much of a token one. Some contact was made with one or two individuals. The N.C. members are intending to suggest to the branch that one of the relatively unknown comrades join the CCF to find out what is taking place in the movement. The branch is meeting regularly and at present is discussing the material in the latest international bulletin.

No doubt all comrades have been watching recent developments in the CCF, the expulsion of the Stalinp-CCF MPP's by the Manitoba convention, the resignation of the president on the basis of opposition to the Atlantic Pact, the tabling by the Sask CCF convention of a motion on the Pact, and the sharp attack that Colin Cameron of the B.C. section launched against the national leadership. Comrade Bullock has sent in an interesting report on the B.C. situation following the electoral debacle and Cameron's call for a return to socialist principles. Comrade R. has seen Rodney Young who informed him that there have been no concrete steps underway to mobilize the left wing. Young seems demoralized and paralyzed, says that the Stanley Park club is merely a name with only 4 activists left and the situation is such that even the Stalinists could walk in and take it over without any great difficulty. R urged that the left immediately float a regular paper like the Old "Flame" once published by the North Vancouver CCF that would take up the real issues confronting the CCF ~~and~~, could freely circulate in all the clubs and provide a mdium around which the left could organize and become political ly developed. Also suggested that attempts be made to put Cameron on the road

as spokesman, contact organizer for the left wing, independent of the CCF apparatus. Young promised to take up these suggestions with his closest contacts and keep us posted. R intimated that we would toss in our weight, experience and ability wherever it would do the most good and would lend assistance in any field required. It was not refused. R made an appointment to meet Cameron on July 22. We have received no report yet but over the phone Cameron appeared to be quite friendly. Cameron told R that he had managed to get authorization for the publication of a monthly internal bulletin. Young informed us that there was considerable opposition to the publication of the Cameron article in the Prov Executive. "They took the position that the article was extremely harmful to the CCF, that it was not a correct evaluation of the situation, that Angus MacInnis should draft a counter article for immediate publication, and further that no more contentious articles should be published in the CCF NEWS unless they had the consent and permission of the Executive Committee. The position was sustained by a vote of 6 to 4. MacInnis' article appeared in the last issue. Only telling point that he makes is that Cameron is as much if not more than anyone else to blame for the degeneration and capitulationist tendencies that he claims have taken place as he was provincial leader all these years. From odds and ends that appear in the paper it would seem that Cameron has control of it. According to Young the Winch faction (I gather this is the support of the Coldwell gang) has little support in the section. Young denigrates the possibilities of expulsions on the basis of the protection of the constitution.

In a previous letter to Comrade R I raised the matter of the advisability of making an entry in B.C. Here is Comrade R's reply. "Entry, until the picture clarifies slightly would be pointless. Unquestionably we could get in but for a time some of us would continue to be objects of suspicion. But so far as entry is concerned as a tactic, the composition of the CCF as it is at present does not warrant its active consideration. If as a result of the stimulation we supply to the flagging and demoralized atoms of the left wing, a situation develops which could shape up into a split our activities as catalysts of this development will have us in a position to be in on the ground floor. Much spadework has to be done before this eventuality. I have no doubts about the ability of the branch comrades to cope with even the tasks of entry, if it should become necessary. I also raised of course the matter of increasing our CCF fraction at once. At present we have one comrade in the CCF, a comrade of quite limited ability. R continues; "We have not essayed to send anyone into the CCF (a) outside of C there was no one available to send; (b) if we had someone available, where would we send them? The condition of the Vancouver units is unbelievable and no useful purpose could be served nor would we gather any information that we don't already come by now." Comrade R closes off with the remarks that he will have a clearer picture after speaking with Cameron and will take up some of the other suggestions in the next letter.

It is interesting to note Young and Camerons friendly attitude and comrade R's comment that "unquestionably we could get in." It is necessary that we receive R's additional information before making any definite decisions but on the basis of the above I am in favor of immediately sending in C to the ~~the~~ CCF and anyone else who we can possibly spare to build up a faction. What about Frank etc. What club? That is another for the comrades on the spot to decide however off hand I would say Stanley Park. This atomization of the ~~the~~ clubs only makes it all the more favorable for us to get in on the ground floor and off hand I would say is the most favorable grounds for an entry. I think that we can immediately and should immediately send C, F and any one else into the CCF. But working as a fraction when we are so small and a considerable number of our comrades are extremely well known as Trotskyists is not in my mind taking sufficient advantage of the

terrific opportunities that are opening up for us in the CCF above all the B.C. section. The fact that the CCF in B.C. and the left wing is in a bad state of demoralization is a favourable factor and not an unfavourable one in my opinion. Cameron and co would be more reliant on us, we will be able to integrate ourselves more effectively. This atmosphere is only temporary, transient. With us in there the situation can be rapidly transformed. Without us this left wing development which is taking place that it may be unorganized, pessimistic does not negate the fact that it is actually developing, can evaporate or fall into the lap of the Stalinists. At any rate the electoral defeat which paved the way for a real search for a new way, verified our position and opened opportunities for us can be transformed into a real defeat for the entire Canadian labor movement. Is it possible for us to make an entry in Vancouver and remain out side elsewhere. I think so

I am unable to report whether there has been any discussion on the question of CCF fraction work or entry in the Vancouver branch. Doubtless there has. We have received no minutes for some while so I do not know ~~anyone~~ what the general opinion is. I have been considering the idea of raising the matter officially but would like to get the opinions of the N.C. members on the question. I favor the immediate sending into the CCF of anyone and everyone we can possibly spare. On the basis of the above information I favor immediate entry of the Vancouver branch but suggest that this matter be not officially raised in the branch until we receive further information R promises us and the opinion of the N.C. members is registered. Even should the N.C. members on the basis of their knowledge and experience ~~urge~~ entry I think it should be ~~in~~ in the nature of a recommendation to be decided upon by the Vancouver branch. The tactic of entry is of such a delicate nature that in my opinion it requires the anxious enthusiastic endorsement and active support of all or nearly all of the persons who are expected to carry it out. to be successful ~~there is the possibility of meeting the opposition of the branch and the N.C. members~~ ~~however~~ I understand that the class is continuing and has been fairly successful. R reports that the branch on his recommendation ~~has~~ turned down the trade union job offered to one of the comrades. One of the comrades has been elected to Local 1-217's Strike committee. All comrades are going to attempt to get on the Zone committees. Branch seems to be making considerable progress in the IWA and I gather has fair working relationships with Whalen. About half the branch attended a series of discussions held with the Seattle comrades over the July week-end

The Toronto branch has held four streetcorner meetings in the past month or two. All have been quite successful with paper sales averaging 40 odd copies at each meeting. The branch has just finished a series of 5 classes on the History and Lessons of the Russian Revolution attended by an average of 7 persons mostly comrades. A new class on the Development of Socialist Thought is due to commence next week and carry over until the fall forums. The branch has struck off several comrades for CCF fraction work however there is nothing to report as the CCF and CCYM appear to have closed up for the summer and there is no evidence of any repercussions in Ontario of other CCF developments. About 120 copies of the ~~last~~ June issue of LC were mailed out to addresses obtained in CCF NEWS(BC) resulting in three or four new subs. The branch mailed almost 400 copies of the last issue to B.C. CCF sympathizers obtained from a financial contribution list in the paper. First sub came in yesterday. They are all from small towns as these do not need street addresses. Toronto is now calling around on persons who subscribed to the paper two months ago and at the time seemed to be genuinely interested. A public meeting ^{is} being held on August 18 in memory of Comrade Trotsky.

There is little to report from other points. Prince Rupert comrades have been tied up with a great deal of overtime work. There has been no word from the Streamstown area for some while. The Windsor comrades appear to be effectively integrating themselves in the UAW. They were quite active in the CCF campaign in that area and have established a few good contacts. One of the comrades is of the opinion that with the colonization of another comrade there they would be well on the way to the building of an effective branch.

A few months back the IS sent us a desperate appeal for increased financial support. The IS is facing a financial crisis, receiving only about half the minimum necessary to carry on its work. Quatrieme Internationale has missed one or two issues and has recently been appearing in roneo. We have not received any copies of Die International or the Itlain magazine for some months. Essential comrades have been forced to curtail their political work in order to raise funds. They have appealed to us to guarantee them \$25 a month. It would be a considerable aid if the N.C. members would get after the branch secretaries or see to it themselves that every last penny possible is raised and forwarded to the N.O. In the last two months we met the appeal and half as much again as we were somewhat behind. The last couple of months has seen our financial situation deteriorate a bit. It is urgent that we keep it up as high as possible ~~XXX~~.

A considerable number of subs have expired in the past few months. They have been pulled with the last issue. We are sending notices to the expirers within the next few days and have already sent off in the mail a complete listing of the subs to the various branches and members at large or those in their locality.

We would be interested to know what the comrades think of the last few issues of the paper. We could put contributions from outside points to very good use. The fact that the last issue was the work almost entirely of one comrade has cut down the efficiency of the N.O. badly. By the way the N.O. is taking a one week vacation ~~starting from~~ the week starting August 8 or 15th

(ends) Healy - British F.I.

Reg Bullock (R.C.)

August 8, 1949 ✓

↓
Culled from R.B.'s letter dated July 26th 1949

Bill Hartley, a CCF Prov. Exec. member, candidate in last election, working electrician, young good militant but somewhat naive called on R at his home. Made familiar complaint about the exodus of the Trotskyists after which there was a discussion. Gave picture of CCF, same picture of situation as Young gave but differed in that he said situation in smaller settlements and centres less demoralized than urban areas. Felt that present Executive and leadership were incapable of giving a lead which would consolidate and rebuild the CCF. Lined up solidly with Colin Cameron. Reported that nothing being done to consolidate "left." His only contribution to question as to what could be done was to say that a sound first Term program must be hammered out for 1953 elections.

R made the following suggestions; convention of a conference of known left wingers in immediate vicinity to which would be submitted these proposals; organization of left wing through the medium of an independently published journal, the setting up of an internal apparatus to co-ordinate and give direction to activities, the subsidization of at least one spokesman and organizer. All this to be undertaken independently of the official organization.

The conference should take the initial ~~XXXXXX~~ steps to clarify and establish its basic program; to be effective it must be based on an intransigent opposition to capitalism and reformism; it must contain a section of "immediate demands" to cover those things and events which press daily and heavily on the working class; a clear orientation on major national and international affairs must be evolved and stated

Hartley impressed, with promise he was going to try to get things started.

Met Cameron through an appointment. Position on UE and Smelters exactly coincides with ours. Told R. that the executive wanted to censor MacInnis' article in reply to Cameron ~~XXXXX~~. Cameron opposed this. While there with Cameron, heard over the phone that Prov Secretary instructed Editor of CCF News to not publish any more letters favourable to Cameron's views. Cameron said urban areas and Provincial Committee smothered in debt and demoralized.....better in outside points.

Cameron appears to recognize that the chips are down. Apparently he has practically completed arrangements for a regular radio broadcast independent or official support. Appears to be counting heavily on internal bulletin. Revealed that no steps have been taken to concretely organize the dissident elements. Asked for his opinion and what suggestions he had.

R outlined proposals made to Hartley. Cameron appears to have concurred with R's suggestions point by point, and is undertaking to start the ball rolling to see what can be done. Promised to keep in touch

In process of discussion R raised question of our re-entry into CCF. "I did not propose a bloc nor intimate a group entry; wanted to find out the attitude

Page 2 of letter Aug. 8, 1949 "For ~~Gand~~ Fritz" *Murray*

...wanted to find out the attitude with regard to readily indentifiable Trotskyists. Phrased it this way: 'That in view of the oft repeated complaints by many CCF activists, with whom Ruth and I were in frequent contact... that is was a mistake for us to have left the CCF,' what did he think of our possible re-entry.

"Substance of his answer had a great deal of ability to offer, organizational and political knowledge, understanding of the CCF apparatus and personalities, etc., etc., however, our identification with Trotskyism and communism would make all of our activities and those with whom we associate objects of immediate suspicion! That our presence would supply value ammunition to the Right; that our technical and constitutional objection to the entry, if raised, would not be difficult to overcome; that until such time as the left sections are firmly established, the presence of well-known members of the Trotskyist tendency would be a handicap.

"... do not feel that it was advisable to pursue the subject further (at this juncture)? Feel that a start has been made to establishing a workable base."

August 22, 1949

Dear Reg;

Intended to write this short note to you as soon as I returned last Friday from holidays but each time I sat down to do so someone came in and I balled up everything. Spent an interesting Sunday with two comrades from Montreal and today was taken up with a lengthy confab with a very good contact who dropped in, a comrade and a passer by who saw our shingle outside and came up to get a copy of the paper and buy a couple of pamphlets. And the other day a hydro man who passed by the door dropped in to have a lengthy discussion on Stalinism and the Soviet Union. All very interesting and valuable but time taking.

As you can imagine there is a terrific pile of work here. So I don't intend to say much aside from congratulations on the inspiring struggle you put up on the job and to make a few remarks on the proposed Stanley Park debate.

Very glad to hear that we have been approached for a debate. Hope we can arrange more and more regardless of how many attend the Park meetings and their political character. As a matter of fact we should write it up for the paper...this coming issue.

Hope I am not too late to say my word on the title chosen and ~~WAX~~ possible if you agree, to arrange a change. "Can the CCF become the vehicle to accomplish the transition to socialism." I think it would be a political error for us to debate this question. This is putting ~~WAX~~ the RWP dead smack up against the CCF. The only thing our debaters can say is no...the RWP is going to be the vehicle. I do not think that we are prepared to say this. We may be making an entry into the CCF in a short while --- the task in this period is therefore not to set up our party as a sharp alternative to the CCF but to help in the formation of the left wing, its political clarification and its consolidation around the Trotskyist program. We want the debates discussions etc but we don't want to talk at large on organization but on program. We want to advance our program on war, the fight for civil rights against red baiting and so forth. We will talk organization on the side to the best elements in the CCF who are listening to us, we will give them more of our ideas and bring them into our party or our CCF caucus. To talk RWP versus CCF only erects a barrier between us and the militants who have an organizational loyalty to the CCF but who are groping closer and closer to our program.

To my mind it would be best if we could arrange the debate on the question of the war danger and how to fight it. On or the class struggle, and so forth. Debate or advance our position on some question which is an immediate one and which the left needs clarification on in order to develop. In this way we will prove our selves to these leaderless confused CCFers to be leaders. We will build political capital at large and will bring the best elements to our side. The latter we will do a real job on.

Will you strike of one of the comrades to write up a report for the paper. This would be an excellent item for the October issue. Just what we need to draw hesitant CCFers closer to us to wipe away their fears their conservatism.

What have we got for the coming issue of the paper? Do you think we could have something on the IWA, the report you sent in was very interesting this together with the latest developments at large would be an interesting article.

On the CCF I am think it over as to whatehr we should carry a lengthy artiocl or editroail on the next speps for the CCF, puting forward a series of ideas as a program around which the left should organize

Will drop you a line at the end on this week I hope.

Incidently we got five subs out of the mailing of the 500 copies of the paper to names pulled out of the CCF NEWS financial election campaign. All from small towns where we did not requirree street addresses. This to my mind is truly phenomenal. \$ persons went to the trouble to write us ~~XXXXXX~~ out a sub. Terrific opportunities awiat us in the BC CCF.

I am sending the addresses along in the hope that sometime some of them might be visisted. The comrades should be really inspired by this news.

comradely

Ross

September 1, 1949

Grenier - P-M Bédard

To the Vancouver branch;

Dear Comrades;

Comrade Whitney has forwarded us the results of some of the discussions that have taken place in the branch and branch executive on the recent developments in the CCF and the orientation of our party to these developments. There has been discussion in other sections of the party on this problem. The National Committee is as yet going through the very laborious work of exchanging ideas via the mail and has not yet been able to present any documentation to the party for a more thorough and concrete discussion.

Comrade Grenier, a member of the National Committee has just informed the N.C. that he will be attending the IWA convention that is being held in your city in the near future. While he will be working with the IWA fraction it would be well if the branch could manage to put aside an evening or one of its branch meetings to permit Comrade Grenier an opportunity to obtain a rounded picture of CCF developments which he would be able to transmit to other members of the N.C. upon his return.

Upon Comrade Grenier's return the N.O. expects to be able to present some material ~~xxx~~ on the CCF for discussion in the party. Any comrades who would like to submit contributions to the discussion are urged to forward them as soon as possible for preparation for mimeographing in the internal bulletin.

If the IWA fraction thinks it necessary to prepare Comrade Grenier in advance for the coming IWA convention he can be reached through La Verite.

One of the Prince Rupert comrades has been elected as a delegate to the TIC Convention in Calgary. ~~xxxx~~ Will any Vancouver comrades be delegated by their unions? If so would they get in touch with the N.O. at once.

The N.O. would also like to know as soon as possible if there will be any comrades coming east to attend the CCL convention in Ottawa.

with revolutionary greetings

Ross Dowson.

September 2, 1949

Dear Bill; *Whitney*

Enclosed you will find a letter to the branch which I think is pretty well self explanatory.

Have also enclosed part of the mail list you asked for. There are two batches. The one batch in Don Dornand's handwriting is a group obtained some while back by going through the CCF NEWS(R.C.) and reading club reports, elections etc. and obtaining the names from there. The other group are names obtained by going through the CCF News election campaign list of contributors. It is by no means complete. and there may will be duplication within the list. We mailed a great many more names but did not have the apparatus to type them up for you on a list. We of course have the copies of the paper if we want to do another mailing.

Through the last mailing of a little more than 500 copies we obtained 6 subs. This is truly phenomenal and shows a real interest exists in the CCF for our ideas. I have already sent Reg some of the names of the persons who subscribed. Incidentally I forgot to tell you that we were only able to take names from CCF NEWS of persons living in small communities where there was no need of a street address. Here are a few more of the slips together with two persons who renewed recently by mail. A Mail renewal is a rarity even for persons who have been around our party for sometime and are genuinely interested. When a door to door obtained sub renews in my opinion someone should hot foot down to have a talk with them, take some literature etc.

Would you pass the two receipts along to Kort with thanks.

Would you pass this information on to the IWA fraction. Somewhere back our comrades in Lloydminster met a CIO oilworkers organizer in that community who they got to know very well and with whom they worked very closely in an attempt to organize the well workers in that area. The fellows name is Peter Bakosha. He told the comrades that he had been in the CP and had been expelled back in 1929. allegedly for being a Trotskyist. It appears that he became politically dead. In discussions with the comrades he appeared to be very sympathetic to our position and showed a considerable grasp of Marxism. Since contacting our comrades he has read considerable of our press. He claimed to know Whalen Bradely and Comrades fergusson and Macphie but did not appear to know their political affiliation. Angus does not know him to the best of his memory. I gather from recent correspondence that he took sick while working in Lloyd, although he had worked hard and layed considerable ground work they then gave him the sack. The bureaucrats remarked that he had been circulating in bad company(us). At anyrate he is now organizing for the IWA at Kamloops or Kelowna and told the comrades that he intend to look us up. No doubt he will be at the convention. It would be well if we looked him up. Just in case he forgets to look us up

Have we been able to distribute the paper to any of the CCF club meetings. The Toronto branch is doing so this coming month when the clubs gett rolling again. I would be very much interested to know waht the reaction of rank and file club activists ~~main~~ to our paper distributions. I see you are forming a fraction in the Teamsters. Give us the good news next time you have a chance.

Some Toronto branch members raised the matter of Lloyd and tom's suspension

in a branch meeting a few weeks ago. I am very much embarrassed by the fact that there has been no formal statement or no document circulated in the party on this question. Remember some while back Vancouver took upon itself to draw up a document on the lessons of the experience. I seem to recall that Reg and you took this task on and the plan was that we would put this in an internal bulletin along with the formal statement. Are you going to be able to work on this in the foreseeable future do you think. If not I think that I will have to take it on. Not that I want to at all but I do not think we can afford to continue to let it ride and ride. Would you speak to Reg and let me know just what the score on this is?

How is literature circulation in the branch. Frank never replied to a lengthy letter I wrote on the importance of selling literature to the comrades. Vancouver has not picked up any literature from Pioneer or 87 King for almost two years now. I wonder if it would not be well to take the matter of a literature agent who will be Johnny on the spot with material at every branch meeting and class with the branch executive.

Had better close this off if I expect to get home for supper.

comradely

Ross

September 2, 1949 ✓

Dear Reg;

Have just shoved a pile of stuff off in the mail to Bill Whitney and figure that I had better get down to dropping you a line before I have to drop everything to get on the paper.

Thanks for the excellent reports that you have been sending in on the CCF. They are a big aid in giving the scattered N.C. members a picture of the situation. I have in the last week received a letter from Murray and also one from Angus on the proposals that I made in recent N.C. correspondence. Have had nothing from Jean but the other day he phoned in to tell me that he could arrange to go to the IWA convention either as a delegate or observer. If as a delegate his local would have to pay and it was in very bad shape. We settled for an observer (as an functionary he should have no difficulty in having voice) He is arranging to come here for a day or so prior to leaving for Van so we can go over the IWA situation and the CCF question. So you will be seeing him shortly and will be able to really put him in the picture. I am going to ~~XXXX~~ see if he can drop off here for a day on the way back while everything is fresh in his mind so we can have a further discussion.

I will type out Angus' and Murray's comments tomorrow if I have a chance but here it is in a nut shell. Angus and of course every onelse wants a full national discussion on the question first but is generally in favor of immediate entry in Vancouver before Cameron and co line it all up under their control. Murray is doubtful, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ agreed that entry is in the cards but doubtful about timing. Should be cautious possibly wait until economic crisis develops to make situation more fruitful in CCF however that will give you a rough idea. Just so there will be no room for distortion Will send you most pertinent quotes. I am of course absolutely opposed to any slap bang rush, liquidation of the party, and our precious paper, all the prestige that we have built in the past three years..and it is considerable. However I am in favor of getting in on the ground floor, I hope we can do some preparatory work before the big left wing develops so that we will be in a position comparable to the Healy group in the BIP. In my opinion our entry at a time like this may be the decisive factor that will determine if the left will develop or be set back for a considerable time.

Well anyway this is no longer a satisfactory method of discussing the question. It will have to be taken off the plane of reports, fragmentary comments and so forth and some serious documentation drawn up for circulation amongst the comrades. When Jean comes back stuffed with information and the various points of view I intend to hear it all and then set aside time to draw up a document on the question. I will send a draft to the N.C. embers so that those who disagree will have time to write up a reply and those who agree generally will be able to help take out any rough spots.

Take time out....sounds good...never seem to be able to even do the day to day work..however it looks like we may be able to solve the question. Ever since Murray and then Ruth pulled out I have been keeping the weather eye open to see if there was some material coming along that would develop into a professional revolutionist. Don B seemed to be all marked up for it. He would obviously be a good choice for not only has he considerable talent and completely tied to the movement but he comes from Vancouver, is familiar with our cadre there and the labor movement there. However the past 6 months have convinced me and apparently DB also that that is not in the cards for a period anyway.

I have never met anyone who was such a bundle of nerves, who was so unstable and unsettled. He finds it extremely difficult to concentrate on a ~~XXX~~ task that he takes on and wants to do. I am beginning to wonder if he will ever hold a job down at least until he runs through that little sock of dough he has. He pulled out of ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ the packinghouse plants for the second time last month. Last time he got himself fired for absenteeism. This time he just walked out. The packinghouse is the only place where we could say we have a concentration, contacts etc. One comrade has been breaking his ass to stay in there. Negotiations are up, there is a possibility of a strike. Don casually informs me and another comrade one day that "By the way Mac I quit the packers today." It seems that the three shift system is "something that this revolutionist is not going to put up with." This incident casted hell in the branch and cost him much of the prestige he had been building up. You know he quit work and took time off to work in the election campaign last fall. He quit about Mid November...fine...we needed him very bad and he was a big help. He grew a great deal in the process of the campaign. But he never went to work for another two and almost three months after that. Would drop down to the office one day, do a little work, disappear for a few days, sleep in, read a bit, go to a beer parlour to drink beer by himself and so on. He was conducting a class at this time and would go unshaven for a week or two at a time. I was going to say that he has a real bohemian streak in him but that is not it. One day...or rather I should say several days I had some real serious talks with him about himself. Do you know he has not decided what life is all about yet. He is still pondering the why, where do we come from, what are we doing where are we going. A question that one settles when one becomes a materialist and for all time when one becomes a marxist, a conscious revolutionist. One day I expounded to him the marxist, the revolutionists viewpoint. He told me he thought it was very trite. He mentioned that he thought there might be something in Spengler etc. But he has done nothing about it, to find out. ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ About all he has done to settle the quest on in any way is to read Mehring's excellent biography of Marx. He is soul sick. I noticed long ago that he has to grit his teeth and drive himself to work. He did an excellent job in the sub campaign but it was a real fight for him to overcome want appear to be natural tendencies, the revolutionist conquered but the fight continues to go on inside. He is a stranger with people, he is afraid of intimacy. He never talks with workers at his place of work, he doesn't know how to make small talk let alone direct conversation the way he wants. I had a long talk with him about it one day and the next day he came to me tell me about a fellow in the shop with him who he found out was one of the original members of the union. Fired up but the gloom swept over again. He is now in Windsor. The Windsor comrades have been pestering me to get someone to join them to help them build a branch. ~~XXX~~ Two of the comrades there are real activists in their local, mixers, talkers, with lots of drive. They hit the floor, one of them took on Reuther when he was there recently. Lots of drive and revolutionary will but the type that don't take time and haven't the bent to get a grasp of revolutionary theory. The want some one who can give a class, defend out theoretical Positions etc. I stalled them off again and a ain but they insist that they can organize a real branch with the aid of such a person. So when they were here over the August holiday week-end I told them to have a talk with Don. And if they were agreeable and he was agreeable then they could raise the matter with the branch. Don wanted to go the branch reluctantly oked it. We really could not afford it but hate to miss a bet in Windsor. I hear he has a job in the same shop as my young brother and they are preparing a series of classes and are setting up a branch apparatus. So I think Don is out for a while...at least until he settles the question of what it is all about.

We have another comrade David Williams who is an excellent type. Completely tied to the party, stable hard workers, intelligent, has come a long way since he came in to the movement 3 years ago. He is anxious to become a professional. We have talked it over. But there are other factors that make it very difficult. He is married and has one child. He is completely crippled in one leg from infantile paralysis. He needs \$35 to \$40 a week to keep his family although his wife who is in the party and

an excellent type could supplement it a bit. In these troubled times with the depression threat we cannot be sure how stable a position we will be in to hold onto him besides myself. He would have the greatest difficulty in getting a job at which he could make a living at. After the Rogers strike he was out of work quite a while and really had no worried. I have discussed this matter quite candidly with him as he is on the branch executive and is the most active and reliable comrade in the Toronto branch. Together we have decided to see what we could do with a comrade Barry Brent.

This comrade is really a brilliant comrade, has a very penetrating mind, grasps complex and abstract theoretical questions quite easily. He is a very good writer in my opinion. As a matter of fact his articles are the only ones that go into the paper almost exactly as he turned them in. He has a very fine personality. Our highest door to door sub getter. Comes from a very petty-bourgeois background but he to a large extent has wiped it out. Was a university student last year. This summer took a job as a ditch digger and almost organized the job he was on. He learns very rapidly and has considerable political skill. Unfortunately he is also a poet of some skill. For all its brilliance his work in the party is very erratic. The trouble is he doesn't know what he wants to do with himself. And he is more or less at the cross-roads. He wants to be a poet (a revolutionary one of course) He thinks he has a real talent. I don't know if he could be the Diego Rivera of poetry he would at least be a competent one. I have for some while been subtly and on occasions not so subtly putting the heat on him to become a professional revolutionist. The decision will be made on his part within the next two months. I think things are going our way. I hope that they are desperately. For by hook or by crook we have to build a skilled political leadership and my development has been seriously hampered by my being so tied down in routine work. This comrade whoever he is and when we get him will of course take over as sort of Toronto branch organizer and M.O. worker. This will permit me to do a little thinking instead of tailing along behind everything. And it will be a big step in building a ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ national leadership.

Of course you know we haven't got the funds but I look at this as being the smallest of our problems. We will get them when we have to and I am convinced we have to.

~~XXXXXXXX~~ I have given you all this dope as I know you will be interested in how Don is coming along and of course the building of the professional leadership is one of the most important problems confronting the M.C. Of course you know Angus and or you should be here if only for a year or so however we all know the difficulties. The CCF developments and the questions as to the shape and form of our existence that they pose make it rather difficult to decide some questions that confront us there. We have to have a headquarters in Vancouver. If I knew now that we were not going to make an entry there within the next three or four months I would insist as best I could that we immediately get a headquarters again. And then having done that that we make preparations for grooming someone to take on the post of branch organizer. Probably you however it would be a pity to root you out of the very fine trade union situation you have put yourself into.

Have you received Socialist Outlook yet. I told you I had sent in a sub in your name. Just in case you may not start with your sub until the September issue I am enclosing the August issue. You will see by this issue how well our comrades have advanced in putting forward our position on many questions. Of course it still has a centrist character but it is coming along well. I wonder if we cannot put it to some use in developing the left wing in B.C. CCF. First ~~XXX~~ I ever saw of it was in the CCF NEWS. I would not like us to be pushing it openly as it might rebound against our English comrades. Perhaps a fellow like Hartley or others might have the bug put into their ear and get some bundles of it for sale. Of course we want to push Labor Challenge. Do you think putting a sub campaign within CCF clubs ~~XXX~~ would hamper

any future work we may take on. I think not and am of the opinion that we should attempt to establish Labor Challenges as a vehicle of opinion for CCF left wingers. I am sure that the last two issues were warmly received by the left...the next one will be also. I am sure that they want to see what we have to say on the problems that confront them in B.C. and what is going on in other sections of the party. Many of our Vancouver comrades are not going to get in unless there is a strong ~~feeling~~ left, independent feeling in the various clubs....since they won't be going in incognito I see that we have everything to gain by having those comrades attempt to really build B.C. CCF reading list. But the Outlook and a wide distribution of it would aid us also and it would be well if we can get someone to get over bundles of it. After all it will have the prestige of an already existing left in that holy of holies the British Labor Party.

That job switch of yours to the IWA has certainly proved a big thing for us. You must be quite a popular figure, some chairman and all. Are you going to be a Delegate to the convention. What forces will we have there. So Whalen and Bradley have the wind up again. Are they doing anything about building a solid caucus under the selves or do they think that they will be able to continue to muddle along, by ~~not~~ shying everyone mentions the word Trotskyism stall the Catholic Action from moving ahead. That significance do you attribute to the fact that the Stalinists for the past year have kept off Whalen and Bradley's tail, never calling them Trotskyists and reporting some of their more militant actions. The little item we had about Lloyd and his local came from the Stalinist WUOC press. We still don't get the IWA paper. I would gather from the Stalinist press that they do not fear Whalen very much, that he is not building up anything under him and therefore they can afford to report his doings with an element of impartiality. If he was building anything and they were convinced that he was a hardened opponent of theirs they would keep putting the axe to him regardless of his actions.

That "talk program" line but don't give the opposition a handle! a name, is an old one advanced by all opponents of serious trade union and political work, afraid of principle, to stand up and be counted, of hard organizational forms demanding loyalty to program and ideas. I am rather surprised about what Lloyd says about Stan. When he took the leave of absence he talked about devoting full time to trade union work and announced doubts about the Trotskyist program or you might even say the socialist future, from reading a letter he sent to Don. How do we stand now with Stan. It was good to hear that we have taken in two new comrades.

What is our line now on the IWA. Is there any sentiment to by-pass the government regulations on the vote. I gather that the vote deal will take the union into a season when it is in its most unfavourable bargaining position. Your job action revealed a real feeling of militancy on the part of that plant anyway. What is the relationship generally in the union. I suppose we will be getting a good part of the answer in the next issue of Labor Challenge.

Hope you will be able to find time yourself or delegate someone else to keep us in touch with CCF developments. Your very full reports so far have been a big aid. Can we get the inside picture of what took place at the recent provincial council meeting. I see that CCF News continues to publish letters on the Cameron McInnis dispute and Turner has joined in. I suppose Rod Young or his side kick will give us the low-down.

That little US proposition that I wrote you about in a hurry a while back has been settled in our favor.

Must get on with the paper

comradely

Ross

September 27, 1949

Brtiannia Beach

Dear Bill

How about dropping us a line first chance you get. I am very much interested to know what you have been doing with yourself the past few months, what is new in the Mine Mill and so forth.

Have you been getting inot Vancouver this summer. I do not recall seeing it mentioned in the Vancouver report of their recent get together with the Seattle comrades that youwere there.

Possibly you have not heard that Vancouver has taken in two new comrad. I gather that the classes they have been holding have been quite successfu. I havent heard anyhthing on recent IWA developments. The comrades seem to have little time to write. Of course the most favourable of all party building developments have been unfolding right on their door step and the are all pretty well tied up with work. I gahter from the last word that we received that Lloyd is finding himself more and more isolated in the IW, that the right wing is increasing its stranglehold on the union and that the ACTU is becoming more influential. All his illusions about being able to work with the bureaucracy appear to be sahttering. The unfortunate part about it all is that he seems to have been unable to really organize any rank and file support but of course that wasn't his perspective. Reg has been doing some excellent work in the union. The outfit he was working for fired him recently and through very fine on the job action he was able to win reinstatement. It appears that Lloyd is adopting a more friendly attitude towards us. Lloyd took a very good stand on the company offer and the borad findings in a conversation with Reg but waht happened to it, waht the relationship of forces were in local 1-217 I do not know. Probably we will be receiving all the inside dope in the mail in the next day or so.

Of course the biggest development of all is the terrific opposition the arose in the CCF following the electoral defeat. Do you get the B.C. CCF News. If you dont you should. At anyrate you would have read the excerpts that we published from Cameron's statement. The West Coast paper has been full of expressions of solidarity in the letters to the editor column. Even Arthur Turner opportunist that he is came out with quite a sharp critical letter on the defeat and the Coldwell leadership. All t ese bur-
eaucrats went along with the opportunism when it was paying off in votes an prestige but when opportunism doesn't pay off---well. At a y rate Cameron's stand has given voice to many other dissidents who have bñen worried a about the right turn of the CCF for sometime but have been unable to find a method of expression. The opposition as you can see from the report of th Sask convention in the August issue of Labor Challenge and the letters that we reporduced in the September issue is quite extensive across the West. There have been no open signs here in the East since the CCYM took its stan against the Pact but no doubt it is stewing away underneath. Of course the East has no radical tradition comparable to B.C.'s.

We have been really bending the paper towards the CCF left in the last few issues....and with some effect too. Unfortunately we are pretty well on

the outside of it all but the paper has met a good reception wherever we have been able to place it. We mailed 600 copies of the August issue to a list of names obtained from the CCF election campaign donation list. We were limited to using names from small towns requiring no street address. And we got six subscriptions in reply. This is really phenomenal. To go to the P.O. for a money order, to write a note and mail it, experience tells us, is a real political act of consequence. If six got us subs then a good many of the rest must have had good effect also. We have mailed another 500 copies of the September issue but it is not yet time to find out their effect.

Reg was able to contact Cameron, Young and an ex MPP Hartley contacted him. All were very friendly and interested to hear our advice on the necessity to organize the left. Reg indirectly posed the question of our entering to give them a hand and while Cameron scared off on the whole the reception was friendly. I have raised the matter of making an entry in Vancouver but remaining out here in the East to carry on the paper, increase our fraction in the CCF until the situation is more favourable. The Vancouver comrades have discussed the matter but have come to the conclusion that they should not do so. The matter has been left pretty well at that. But in the next few weeks as soon as we get the next issue of the paper off I hope to find time to prepare a document on the question of the CCF. They have sent a couple of comrades into the CCF in the last month or so. Here in Toronto we have struck of quite a number of comrades to scout around the CCF, to find out what is cooking to join. But just how active we will be in this work in the East we are unable to gauge at present as things appear to be very quiet.

From here it looks as if once again the left in B.C. will fail to organize, get beyond the stage of criticism. It appears from the CCF News letters to the editor column that a reaction is now starting to set in against the criticism which if not given a more positive character is obviously disruptive in character. From Reg's report Cameron and Young are openly quite cynical about being able to do anything. They claim that the urban clubs are in bad shape from the effects of the defeat. But the real trouble is their lack of guts and there is no force in their that can drive them forward. It is of course hard to say what will come of it in the immediate months ahead. One thing is certain that this wave of criticism is even if it is not capitalized on now will provide a real basis of a left wing in the future. The criticism as you can see from the letters and Cameron's article has been of quite a fundamental nature. How did you like the way we handled it all in the last two issues. I think we did quite an effective job. I am sure that the paper has caused a considerable disquiet in the CCF. Rod Young sent us an order for In Defence of Marxism the other day and in the process handed us a big bouquet for the August issue. Nice for what it is worth. My biggest disappointment has been that the CCF press has not said a word about us.

One thing seems certain to me and that is that the general perspective of the party must be towards eventual entry in the CCF.... and that we must immediately where conditions make it favourable increase our caucus work in the CCF.

Things are pretty quiet here in Toronto. We have just closed off with the summer study class work. And now we are getting ready for the fall-winter forums and the financial drive. Hope you will be able to take up your quota and more if possible, I know that some of the comrades are

going to be hard pressed to reach their objective. The Toronto branch has lost five comrades in the last three or four months. Four comrades moved out of town and while we are in contact with them and they are doing a little work you know how it is with most comrades when they get shoved out by themselves and have no chance to really contact the party. We recently sent another comrade to Windsor to give the comrades a hand there. They claim that with the aid of a comrade with some theoretical knowledge that they would be in a position to consolidate ~~the~~ the various contacts they have been working on into a branch. I do not know whether Vancouver has yet learned the fine art of rasinig dough. As an matter of fact some of the comrades there were unemployed for a spell and probably are hard up. But we need the dough to warry on the paper so hook or by crook.

I am enclosing a list of expired subs in Brtiannia. Sorry that you did not get them sooner. They were misplaced. They all received the August issue and a notice that their sub had expired. So that they will be warm when you contactbthem I have just sent them the September issue. Hope you pick them up. Perhaps some of them at the same time will be good for a small donation.

Let's know waht you know. ...particularly recent Mine Mill development Do want us to make an exchange on the books that we sent out to you some time back.

with revolutionary greetings

Ross Dowson.

September 30, 1949 ✓

To the Vancouver Branch;

Dear Comrades;

Comrade Whitney, your former secretary, has written ~~ME~~ to inform us that the ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ financial drive quota of \$300 suggest to your branch is too high. His roll call of the branch and the financial condition of the various comrades is rather convincing that some change will probably have to be made.

He suggests that we should make some revision at this end. We are at a loss to suggest a revised figure and would prefer that the branch at its coming meeting go through the branch membership, tally up the internal pledges then attempt to assess what can be raised from outside the party from sympathizers. On this basis the branch can set its own objective and advise us.

We are convinced that there is a considerable sum of money that can be raised by the branch carefully going over party friends, contacts ~~XXXX~~ visiting them and asking for lump donations, possibly to be paid in two or three instalments. We think this is the most immediate and pressing task confronting the branch and the party and all possible forces should be put into this work.

I have hastily attempted to call to mind names of persons who could be approached and whom we could expect to give us a sizeable donation. Among them I am sure Charles Graham could be expected to give 10 and possibly 20. Lucy MacDonnell is probably good for \$10, Stan Stratton for \$10 possibly \$20-30. I would say that there is at least \$100 at the very minimum amongst those persons whom I met or heard of while I was out there last year. Possibly there are a dozen or more persons in this category and no doubt every comrades knows two or three workers, persons who read our paper, have renewed their subs who would be good for a dollar or two.

Possibly, and we certainly hope, ~~XXXX~~ it will not be necessary to make any serious revision. At any rate we know that the branch and the individual comrades will do the very best they can to raise this very necessary sum of money.

with socialist greetings

Ross Dowson

Vancouver

Found in October 1989

Dear Bill;

Have received the answer regarding Vancouver's Pioneer account and the recordings:

"I do not know the price of recordings of the Militant Chorus. I will check with Jeff when he is around. The two discs of Trotsky is \$10.00 As for anything else like wire recordings of speeches, you would have to write to the N.O. They are arranging it at present and have no price as yet. As for Vancouver's financial state— they have a CREDIT of \$1.61. "

Have heard nothing from Reg on the IWA aside from the lengthy article which we published in Labor Challenge. From this article everything looks alright to me from down here. Possibly it has been all strightened up.

comradely

Ross Dowson

October 3, 1949

Vancouver
Dear Bill; (Mother)

Received your note the other day and figure I had better get an answer off right away before I get swamped with the paper.

On the financial drive; Sorry to hear the sad financial state of the branch. It looks to me as if our only hope is to try to make some of our "friends" pay the shot for the publication of our paper etc. I know that we haven't any too many but thinking it over I believe if we get down to it we can raise a considerable amount this way. I have written Elaine a note on the matter which I think is self explanatory. I seem to recall that this matter of approaching various persons outside the party for dough was discussed once before and there was some opposition raised by someone to the very idea of approaching such persons as Lamont etc. That is aside from whether he could or would give us anything... a moral opposition of some kind. I hope we don't have any of this infantilism this time. We take money from anybody but with no strings attached. Toronto got a considerable sum of money (about 275 dollars) from persons of various types, some Lamonts amongst them. I think we could raise more than most comrades dream via this method. I have suggested a possible list to Elaine by going through the mailing list. Possibly some of them are absolutely worthless but I am sure that there are several others that comrades will be able to think of and make time to go around and visit.

I don't understand about those renewals that Court sent in. I received them all and I have just checked up on them. They are all entered and I know that they received the last issue. They may not have received the previous one as I got the renewals only in time for the last one. I have found that some subscribers do not realize how seldom a monthly paper appears. At any rate their subs are in good order and they are not being charged for anything they did not receive.

To the best of my knowledge there are only two recordings that Pioneer handles. The Trotsky Speech and a record of songs sung by the Militant Chorus. I don't know what their prices are or if they are even available but I will write and find out for you. We have both here and would be only too glad to loan them to you. We have some other albums of working class songs put out by various recording companies. But probably they are available in Vancouver. There is one very good album Talking Union. If you would like we will loan that album to you also. Possibly the Stalinist bookstore handles Talking Union and a few others.

The only item that is outstanding on Vancouver's literature account is one hundred copies of the 1948 Manifesto of the Fourth International. We have long ceased bothering about the monthly bundle of Labor Challenge. Be glad to settle the Manifestos for \$12.

Did you know that Stan once opened an account with Pioneer as it saves double postage that would be incurred through ordering through us. Your F.I. account is also separate from Toronto's. I will drop them a line on the F.I. as you request.

Too bad but I just wrote Court a long letter on literature. just last week. Nothing terribly important in it however.

Would be very glad to intervene in the IWA situation. Upuntil now however yours is the only word on the situation that we have received. I gather Reg has been busy working on the debate and trying to get the roof on his house before the rainy season.

Received a short note on the IWA from Reg on Saturday but it is only in connection with my request for some material for the paper. He has this to say on the IWA. "will try to get about 80 to 1200 words on the IWA into the mail ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ Saturday." I gather it will deal in the main with " the retreat and worm eaten policy of the District leadership during the negotiations and the moth eaten settlement they maneuvered themembership into accepting; the struggle ahead in the period leading up to the District Convention on January 6.7.8. etc. etc."

And that is all. Yours was the first word I had heard that we voted for the settlement. ~~XIX~~ So we will wait as you suggest until we get the fraction report and the minutes from Alex. Time is a good thing to let pass as you suggest when we can afford it. I hope also that we can keep the whole thing calm for as you know it is sometimes a little difficult for really experienced and able comrades to admit an error. We have to take care that we make it as easy for them as possible.

Grenier is Jean. I am also sorry he was unable to go but it appears that he had little to say in the matter when the final decision was made.

Found your comments on the IWA interesting. Hope that Reg gives much more so that we can really see what is going on.

comradely

Ross

October 21, 1949 /

Vancouver
Dear Reg: Bullock

By now you must have received the paper and have had a chance to give it the once over. That was a very good article on the IWA...the only thing wrong with it was its length. It is almost twice as long as we can really afford it to be. However it is so long since we have said anything on the IWA and after all this is by far our best trade union fraction, that I felt I had to let it go. I do not remember making any changes of any importance. Out out the paragraph on Sokora for no other reason than I simply felt we had to cut it down to at least 3 pages and it seemed the easiest to go.

On the Stanley Park debate....I am not any too pleased with it but it was just about the best I could figure we could do. The most desirable situation to have been in would have been to just publish the two speeches. That topic was certainly a hellish one --I wouldn't have relished the position you were in. I gather we were unable to convince them to change it. Well as I saw the problem when it came to writing the debate up..... we want it friendly, educational, we want to play up the CCFers contribution. But this guy O'Brien is certainly an ungodly confusion. There is no clarity, no logic, no development. And this made it difficult to write up his speech. Every paragraph has all kinds of side-swipes against the Bolshevik theory of organization, identification of Stalinism with Bolshevism etc. Well if we print them we have to answer them in the process so I felt we had to carry a running comment as we reported the speech. This method of writing it up took up a great deal of space and so there was little left for you.

I am quite an admirer of the way you handled the questions. I think on the whole we did an excellent job with a tough assignment.

There is one thing you must have noticed in the last series of articles that I have had a hand in dealing with the CCF. We have been trying to get away from the original sin idea. ^{the} CCF is a social democratic movement, ^{not} marxism, its reform or revolution. Most workers in the CCF (possibly not so true in B.C.) do not consider themselves socialists, social democrats, species of Marxists or anything like any of these things. They are going to the CCF on a very low plain, they are not even coming in contact in that organization with any species of socialist thought. We are going to cut them off from it and bring them towards us by exposing the basic bankruptcy of the Coldwells...that is their failure in this epoch to even make and attempt to defend the most simple interests of the class that they ~~lead~~ ^{claim} to represent. They are red-baiters, war mongers, they support the war and all that this implies, higher taxes, no strike struggles etc etc. Of course occasionally we should or could go to the socialist root of the problem. Do you recall how Dobbs handled Thomas in the debate during the presidential elections. ^{Of course on this occasion O'Brien set the pace to a certain extent}

Hope you will have something for the coming issue of the paper. The dead-dead-line will be here on November the 7th, that day of days. But if at all possible it would be best to have it here November 4th

No doubt you noticed that we did not carry through your suggestion on an edit. We had already assigned the article on Lewis, had the one on the debate, and as we had to carry the IS Yugoslav statement there was no room. Will have a good coverage in the next issue.

Received the minutes of the gathering ~~XXXXXX~~ with the Seattle comrades;

From all the reports the branch seems to be coming along very well, particularly when you consider the period that we are working in.

I see however that we still have the old complaints;

The liquor question at the socials; what and who is behind it now? I thought that this was a Lloyd and Tom bugaboo. We have been selling liquor at Toronto socials for 3 years now at .40 cents a shot and have had an incident only once, when a fellow came in already drunk. Bu ffalo has a regular bar. It was open before and after a meeting I attend a year ago August, a public meeting, Trotsky Memorial. If ~~XXXXX~~ the opponents only knew how much of the RWP and SWP is financed by the profits derived from John Barleycorn. If we could solve this question in the branch it would go a long way in solving the financial problem confronting us. And to me it appears to be a necessary social asset to the affairs.

No reports from the center, personal baiss of correspondence; I wish I knew what these comrades who continually raise this matter expected of the N.O. First it is ridiculous to talk about waht the SWP does. They are a party with a battery of functionairies, with money. We are a tiny group with one comrade on the pay-roll and very few persons who have any really political background so that this one functionary is tied in knots ~~XXXXX~~ with all kinds of jobs. Even here the persons who keep raising this point have an entirely false picture of what the powerful many-manned SWP does. We get the material that is sent to all branches, no doubt there are occasional letters that deal with the specific problems of a specific branch. But the circualr material contains no reports of any kind on what is going on in other branches. They published the Party Builder years ago when they were flush and that did this job in a way but it has not been seen for a long time. All that the branches get is an occasional letter on a new pamphlet, or a push letter on an old one, a report on a proposes tour requesting branches to accept assigned dates, a letter on a financial drive, a letter asking for orders of a new bulletin (there hasn't been one for six or seven months that I can recall) I would like to meet this demand that is being made. Whenever there was any occasion that I thought it advisable that I on behalf of the N.O. should intervene I have done so in a formal way with a letter to the branch. As for reports of party dings. A lot of information along this line would be interesting no doubt but actually quite useless, then a gain a lot of it is open to interpretation and if reported on by myself would only raise a rucus in the party, much of it useless and resulting just in waht we dont want to develop---turning the party in on itself.

Take for instance the CCF developments, A report on these developments to my mind only makes up the case for an entry of the Vancouver branch into the CCF. If I reported these in detail not through the N.O. but into the branch I am sure that comrades opposed to entry would be somewhat irritated. Take the Montreal WEL meeting. I am ~~XXXXX~~ of the opinion that the whole thing was a mistake, made by a false estimation of the times in which we live. Grenier's report of it to me is the basis of this believe. I have told the Montreal comrades of my opinion in a letter to the branch but if it was reported to a greater extent than L.O. did I am sure it would only be interpreted by the Montreal comrades as an attempt to uphold my viewpoint. So we would have a little National correspondence debate on this to nobody's gain in my mind.

When I had a talk with Bill last year on this question he hotly raised the matter of his not knowing that Paddy had been dropped. I think it would be fantastic that we would send such reports out to the branches...they would only have a demoralizing effect. He wasn't expelled, there is nothing for anyone to learn, he just dropped away, we were too small. In contradiction to this it is rather odd to see Bill's attitude towards working on a document on the Bradely Whalen experience, one that is full of lessons for the party and while unfortunate should be known. And incidently this affair has been raised by Joe Rose on several occasions in an attempt to make out that they pulled out

even

on account of me. It would appear that the monthly N.C. letter is not ~~XXX~~ meeting with the demand (gather that you go through it and give a report on what you think of value and in the interest of the branch)

The paper doesn't meet the needs of the Vancouver branch; This to me is utterly fantastic. You would think that the Vancouver branch was not ten or eleven persons but several hundred, involved in mass actions, required to give its position on the thousand and one things that develop in that province. You would think from that also that L.C. was a Toronto paper or dealt to a considerable degree with the exclusive problems confronting let us say the workers in Ontario and Quebec. But of course L.C. is no more a "Toronto paper than fly. It is a monthly Canadian journal. Issue after issue goes by without a word on any Toronto development, why probably the last Toronto dateline was last years elections. But there have been plenty of Montreal and Vancouver datelines and if there has been any shortage this lies not in any fault of the editors. As a matter of fact I think that L.C. is admirably suited to the growth of Vancouver---after all we are going to build our party not on day to day problems confronting Vancouverites so much as on our position on the CCF, the IPP, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ the anti-war fight, the problems that are national and problems to which only the most advanced workers are now sensitive to. Of course the persons who raise this can't be serious; if they ~~XXXXXX~~ considered some of the practical problems they would bit their lips....aside from funds (we are having a terrible time financing one paper) wait about writing personally, wait about getting subscriptions for it. They should just stop to look at the results of the last sub campaigns and our circulation on a national scale, ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ let alone our Vancouver circulation. What a joker.

I had ~~XXX~~ a mind to write a letter to the branch taking up some of these matters but there again, just how serious is all this, what would be the results of such an "intervention."

Together these questions do seem to me to show a certain tendency on the part of (is it one, comrade?). A sort of separatist tendency when our little group needs everyone pulling together as best it can. The paper is not very good but L.C. is ours (Vancouver's) as much as it is anyone's in the party. The other attitude even if held by only one person who is vocal can only moderate any real enthusiasm to get out and get subs, after all L.C. doesn't really meet our peculiar needs here in Vancouver, moderate any real enthusiasms to get money from sympathizers in the L.C. financial drive. after all it isn't quite what we want in a paper, we should have one of our own.

And any complaint about lack of contact ~~XXXX~~ between branches without taking into full account the great difficulties that face a movement in West Canada and one that still numbers only a few handfuls is destructive criticism. or at the very least it doesn't help any in anyway.

I raise this whole matter because I wonder if you think anything should be said on any aspect of these questions by the N.C....or should we, would it be best, to let all this go by the board as it doesn't amount to much in the branch and can be satisfactorily handled within the branch.

Most everything else has I believe been dealt with in the N.C. letter. There is one thing more however. How are we with the Bradely-Whalen document. Can we have it soon. I know that my draft was ~~XXXXXX~~ no hell. And again I kept it pretty well restricted to developments around the IWA Pritchett split-away. I did this on purpose as I wanted that it should be as non-controversial as possible yet put over the basic lessons---the relationship of the tradeunionist to the party.

By the way it would be of some value if in the near future we could have something on recent experiences in our IWA work. This would be good for the party

bulletin, if and when we can get it out. How did we come out of the whole thing in the last wage battle. I was suprised to see ~~LLOYD AND TOM~~ no Lloyd and Tom in the IWA convention picutres. I gah ered that they were not even delegates to the Ottawa convention. What is the significance of the Ballard challenge of Fadling for president.

warmest regards

Ross

October 22, 1949

Vancouver;

Bill Whitney

Dear Comrade Lillian; *(Whitney)*

I see from Bill's report that you have been elected the branch educational director....and I gather from one of the minutes sent in that the class we are conducting in the Swedish Hall is not as we have advertised it in the paper "On the History and development of the Working Class Movement" except in the most general sense. ...that you were studying Capital and have now decided to switch over to current events.

Would it not be better if we changed the ad in L.C. and announced the titles of the various lectures. The title we are now carrying appears to me to be rather forbidding not very attractive whereas if we announced various topics we might not get persons down to one but possibly would get them down to another. I think it would give the paper and the party a more dynamic character...here we are dealing not with pages of history but we are attempting to intervene ~~in~~ in world affairs.

Would you raise this matter in the branch and if they agree would you send me a listing of the various subjects that will be dealt with in the near future.

The November 7th one (your meeting is the 10th) will I gather deal with the Russian Revolution in some way. Unfortunately we will not be able to get the paper out to you in time for it to be any use to you for that meeting.

~~XXXXXX~~ Possibly the branch has already discussed this matter but I would like to propose that we attempt to do something with the Tito-Stalin rupture. The Toronto branch is attempting to pull off a forum or debate. It has written to the Yugoslav Legation asking them to supply or let us know where we could obtain a speaker to advance the Titoist position on a platform along with our majority mass figure. If we are successful in arranging that we intend to publicly challenge Tim Buck to defend the position of the Cominform. We have heard no word yet and it is highly probable that we will be ignored however. Next week if we still hear nothing the branch is considering just how to handle this matter most effectively.

comradely

Ross Dawson

October 23, 1949 ✓

Vancouver
Dear Ruth; *Bulllock*

Thanks for the raft of notes and the pile of money. I am enclosing the receipts.

And now to answer a few points your raise.

Possibly you did not see a report of dues and pledges standing that we sent to all branches and members at large dated September 19th. I dont recall exactly but I am fairly sure that it went to Bill who was still secretary at the time.

This statement covering the period of May to the middle of September showed that Vancouver sent in

May—0000 June \$40.00 July 0000 August 0000 Sept \$50.00

There were some comments on the serious drop in contribution that resulted in our receipts falling far below minimum operating expenses.....without mentioning any names it appealed to the branch treasurers to get on their toes.

This is the only method of recording that we have kept in the M.O. I tried to set up a dues system keeping the funds maked separately but it just did not work out. ~~MEMBERSHIP RECORDS SHOWING DUES~~ I conclude that it is pretty well impossible to keep an efficient dues system without membership books and dues stamps. So ~~while~~ we get bigger and have an apparatus I think we will have to let it go. I have also never actual what you could call billed a branch or comrade for money not sent in. If the branch treasurer fails to keep after the comrades about their pledges and lets a month or so slip by it is only in the rarest of occasions that the comrade in question would be in a position to pay up. I know that that has been our experience in Toronto...if the comrades pledge is not collected that month it is not collectable. Most of the comrades appear to be giving just about all they possibly can.

I think from your comments you misunderstand my attitude towards dues and pledges. If I recall correctly there was some talk on this matter before and ~~IX~~ I believe it was along the line of dues. I seem to remember that some of the comrades did not want to accept the dues system set up at the convention (50 cents a month) but wanted to make a dues system that would take inot account the financial state of each comrades so that some comrades would be aying perhaps 20 dollars a month, other married with heavy responsibilities perhaps \$2 a month. ~~XXXXXXXX~~ I was opposed to this in the sense that dues are not a method that the party sets up of raising funds and financing itself but are a gesture of membership in the party. We dont want any financial barriers to membership in the party. On the above basis a new member in the party has to submit to a delving in his personal life which he is not yet prepared for, if single and making forty dollars a week has to face let us say a demand that he pay \$40 a month dues, another demand that he is not prepared for..until he is well integra ed into the party and really finds out waht it is all about.

The idea that I put forward which is the policy of the SWP and other parties in the Fourth, is that dues are obligatory for membership in the party. They are a token sum of money that anyone can pay with little effort. The party finances itself on the basis of pledges. All comrades are expected to make a pledge. But such a pledge is

voluntary. The party should put the heat on all comrades to obtain as high a pledge as possible. It should give comrades an objective (roughly 10 percent) But in essence the amount of pledge will be determined by the comrade himself on the basis of his financial capacity and his political consciousness. It only requires two or three responsible comrades to set the pace in any branch.

I think that it is absolutely essential that the treasurer foster a very serious attitude towards pledges. All comrades are expected to make some kind of a pledge. Comrades are expected to pay their pledge. ~~DO NOT FORGET~~ Voluntary only in a sense.

There are various little devices that can be utilized to keep the pledge system in good operation. In my opinion time should be set aside each meeting for payment of dues and pledges. Comrades who do not make any payment on their pledge at one or two meetings should be spoken to by the treasurer. I think once a month in the financial report by the treasurer the list of comrades names should be read and it be reported whether they have paid their pledge which was for so much or how much they paid on it. I may be a bit naive but I know that I get a bit of a kick out of hearing that I paid my five dollars this month out of what everybody knows is a \$20 a week income. It is a powerful method of pressure. But it is a type of pressure ~~EEK~~ and a type of payment that is more or less in keeping with our old maxim from each according to his ability. A great deal depends on the treasurer but this is so on the basis of any other system also.

I can only say amen to your remark that "an individual who does not accept the elementary responsibility for payment of dues and at least trying to maintain a definite pledge will never measure up in other respects." I recall reading somewhere that Lenin used to follow how the various grouplets in Russia were contributing funds to Iskra very closely...it is a real test of moral, confidence in the party.

I may have also said something about how Habbe used to do it. From some very vivid little descriptions of Don's I understand he was merciless----that he attempted to blackmail and shame the comrades into it. Perhaps Don exaggerates. At anyrate I am strongly in favor of putting all the heat we can, with dignity, on all comrades to meet the financial needs of the party. It would be better to err on the side of mercilessness that for us to wish that somehow we can get along on \$90 in five months.

On the financial drive....If Bill does not know Cooper then don't bother with that name. I thought that he was a fellow who was a member years ago and a close friend of Ed and Bill's. If Mrs McDonnell doesn't send in something before the end of the drive I will certainly drop her a line. I thought you were on good terms with her and it would be good if somehow we could reestablish a personal contact. They took a bundle of ten paper and have written a couple of very nice letters in recently. From here it looks like the campaign is well underway in Vancouver. I hope we can really wring the dough out of our sympathizers, after all we are not asking them to do anything, just to give us money to let us do the work they should be doing with us.

Will be sending a letter out on the campaign before the end of the week.

comradely

Ross

Regulationary Workers Party
87 King Street West, Room 5
Toronto 1, Ont.

November 14, 1949 ✓

Dear Comrades McDonnell

(Entered Vancouver BC)

We were needless to say very pleased to receive your very substantial donation to our fund drive. It will be certainly a big help in the publication of our paper. And with the very favourable developments in the CCF and the world Stalinist movement I am sure that it will really pay off in increasing the influence of revolutionary Marxism.

You know, you become accustomed to talking ~~XXXX~~ along the line that we need the paper more today than we ever did before. For old timers like ourselves who have retained a broad historical outlook that permits us to see further than today and the past few years this old alpa on the back is scarcely necessary. We have needed the paper all along to hold our own ranks firmly together in preparation for tomorrow. Now however we can add to this that big things are on the immediate horizon...tomorrow isn't as far as possible some of us have adjusted ourselves to believe. Certainly the developments in the B.C. CCF are very promising even if nothing much comes of it the the immediate future it is doubtlessly the preparation for a genuine left wing which can only come our way. And as for Stalinism, this monstrosity that must be swept away and which for so long overawed the faint hearts....well it certainly is cracking up.

Yes, big things are in the offing and we just have to ~~XXXX~~ keep Labor Challenge going. So far the campaign is coming along fairly well. Things are tougher, several of the Vancouver comrades have been suffering lay-offs and short time but with more help from our still too few friends and sympathizers I believe we will make it.

By the time you receive this note you should have received the November issue. You will note that we took the liberty of printing you last letter...I hope this meets with your approval.

I notice that the money order you forwarded was made out by E. Graham of Ocean Falls and that the envelope bore that return address. If you would let me know if the donation is in some way also partly from the Graham's I would be pleased to write them a letter of thanks.

Would it be an imposition on my party to suggest that it would be a good idea if you dropped over to see Ruth and Reg Bullock some evening that you have free? I know that they would be pleased, more than pleased, to see you again and have a friendly discussion. Reg tells me in his last letter that Rod Young and O'Brien invited him over to have a serious talk on the left wing. They are soliciting our help.

with warmest fraternal greetings

Ross Dowson

November 18, 1949

Ray den

Dear Reg—

(Bullock)

Thanks for the long letter on the IWA and the CCF.

The CCF material was extremely interesting. I was going to use the information that Young gave you on the National Executive moves for the last issue of the paper but decided it was best not to as perhaps the source would be exposed.

Just how do Young and O'Brien propose to present this article to Labor Challenge. Anonymous I suppose but as left wingers. I see they are shy of putting out a bulletin but don't they feel that such an article would be much more dangerous—going to the press of an enemy political movement. Do they think it wouldn't get around who wrote it. I think it would be quite a feather in our cap to be in a position to carry such an article but for them and the possible development of the left it would seem to me to have considerable dangers.

I think we should really hammer continue to hammer them to the wall on this bulletin idea. From Young and O'Brien's comments and their past they do not appear to be very close to us politically. What is important for us is the using of them to try and latch onto the broad discontented forces that exist in the B.C. section. The money I am sure would be no problem at all. There are all kinds of persons who would be glad to kick in. It would be very good if we could editorialize it along with Young and coy. It could well take on the character of Socialist Outlook. Let some of these old time confusionists that are around and have names babble away in it but be sure we have a strong hand as does Lawrence in the editorial page. This seems to be to be the by far most profitable angle to work on. And I find it hard to believe that Young and Coy are going to find it hard to resist our continued pressure along this line. They still want to work from on top. But they have no allies—even Cameron and his group are totally unreliable....then they have to try to get underneath. In fact I think it could be easily shown to them that if they don't get some kind of rank and file support their way will be greased out for them by the rising fury of the top leadership.

What are so they so fearful of? Isn't the Flame a precedent for an internal bulletin. Coldwell and coy would n't dare move in on an internal bulletin that was sponsored by such persons as Young and was of such proven loyalty to the CCF. Particularly when I am convinced that it wouldn't take many issues to find a substantial support in the province. Cameron and everyone else would be compelled to support you even if only grudgingly.

If they want to go ahead with the article I think we should give them every encouragement and give them our aid in writing it so that we could publish it without having to take a too critical stand on it in the same issue. Can we get it for the next issue. The dead-line will be the fifth of December for this coming issue.

to Young

I dropped the last two copies of Socialist Outlook in the mail with a line that I ~~XXXXXX~~ thought he ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ would find them interesting ~~XXXXXX~~. His attitude to us is a rather strange one. He wants us to come in, failing this he wants to work with us on the closest basis possible but he sharply pulls himself up as an enemy of our party. O'Brien's speech at Stanley Park was quite a surprise to me. I was surprised at his confusion and political naivete. I wonder if we have ever had a clam and freindly talk with them on our conception of the revolutionary party on the question of Stalinism and Bolshevism. Their line seems to me to flow from prejudice of a soft kind. I am sure you have had many discussions with them and know them pretty well inside out but it would seem of me that they must be going through what for them are some surprising experiences right now.

They don't seem to have any illusions about the internal regime of the CCF. As a matter of fact from our differing attitudes on the internal bulletin it would appear that they think we have some illusions. If I remember correctly this CCF internal regime was the soul of all the position taken by Van. O'Brien's speech was astounding for its frankness about the CCF. When it comes to the question of the CCF itself there was little we could say that he didn't. The only illusions he appeared to have was the internal regime...and then of course his completely false idea of the nature of Stalinism, Bolshevism and Trotskyism. They are certainly centrist but they appear to me to be centrists of a very naive and soft kind. It would seem to me that they must be going through some of their illusions...well their attitude towards working us close with us shows this--- What do you think of the idea of just spending an evening with them sometime ~~discussing~~ discussing with them the origins of Stalinism and what Bolshevism and Trotskyism really are. We could loan them Stalinism and Bolshevism by the old man...I would like to bet a buck they have never read it....that they have read practically nothing of ours ---but have formed over the coffee cups, White ~~XXXX~~ Lunch opinions.

But I guess that's enough for them...after all my knowledge of them is nothing to yours....and the big question after all is to use them to get at the CCF ranks or rather to see if they can be got at, what the real situation is in the CCF.

Last month we cleaned up a couple of hundred back copies, August and September issues of Labor Challenge that Windsor returned and we had left over and sent them on to some more of those CCF names. We got two more subs. Here they are-

John Thoraby, Bella, B.C.
J. Silverwood, Minto, B.C.

We sent the other 13 a letter the purpose of which was to try and worm out of the subscribers a reply to find out what they think of the paper etc. Two replied. E.H. Phillips of Lang Bay whose letter we carried in the last issue (Stalinist) and the other George Tarrant of Chilliwack. The latter says he likes the paper but goes on to talk about his loyalty to the CCF, really not very informative and my impression is he is not a very likely element.

You will note that I mentioned in the last circular ~~XXXX~~ letter that it would be good if someone in Vancouver sat down and ~~XXXX~~ wrote out ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ what the present picture of the Vancouver CCF looks like. I think it is necessary for us to ~~XXXX~~ make some kind of estimate of the situation in order to give direction to our own work. ~~XXXX~~ Right now we are working through Young or planning to do so in order to get a bulletin out ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~. The purpose of the bulletin is to find out what the possibilities of actually organizing a left wing are out there. If this bulletin meets with any success, and from our sub work etc I am more or less convinced that it will then it would be absolute folly in my opinion for us to remain on the outside working through Young. In fact if it gets anywhere and Young doesn't undergo a change eh will promptly cut us off not only from making any real contact with the left but also from the bulletin.

It certainly is debatable whether we should enter the CCF in B.C. but it is also by the same token necessary for us to try to put our assessment of the situation down in black and white...What is the situation in the clubs, what we think the possibilities are in the rural areas, what is the general relationship of forces and the direction etc.

Are there any comrades in Vancouver that think that it would be advisable to make an entry. If there were it would be good for the party if such comrade presented a document upholding his idea. If there is no such comrade then it is true that it would be rather artificial for some comrade to prepare a document against entry...however it would be beneficial for the party for some ~~XXXX~~ comrade to write up an evaluation which in a sense would sustain our present line on the B.C. CCF section.

W. W. W. W.

but perhaps Bill could do this.

Our present orientation to my mind can only be based on facts that in Vancouver there is no left or no immediate possibilities of its development. At the same time our relationship with Young and O'Brien reflects our intention to see if one cannot be crystallized, that we think that the basis for its existence is there. If this belief materialized then we are going to have to jump in fast to carry it forward, to prevent it falling into Young's hands, to give it our program etc.

I think that the suggestions that you and Bill make about making preparations to attend the CCF netl Convention if any sort of left wing develops are good but if any real left wing develops I hope that we are in it and that we are delegates at Winnipeg. Certainly if any left develops it would be a good idea to get the English to come over.

I hope we can get Young and coy to get the bulletin out before the Jan CCF National Council meeting. It is going to take a while and several issues to get things moving if there is anything we can move. I don't think that Young and coy need a complete alternative program and policy to submit to the next N.C. They would if the left is already crystallizing but not otherwise. They already have a program - opposition to the three moves that the NE tried to put over at the last NC meeting. rank and file participation in the CCF and rank and file rule. for the preservation of internal democracy in the CCF, in defence of provincial ~~unions~~ and local rights. rejection of the Atlantic Pact, for a socialist policy.

THE IWA...

I can hardly wait for the Catholic Action to go to town on us. In our present state we have everything to gain, if fact they will be actually exposing not us but themselves. What kind of effect are we having in the plants..is Labor ^{Challenge} and are the Trotskyists really any issue? Are Lloyd and Tom going to be swept up and identified with us or are they now pretty clean

You know, we do not receive the Lumberworker. I wonder if there is some way you can get us on their list or have some comrade send it in. Jean forwards the U.S. paper but there is little about Canada in it.

Is it not possible now to fight for Tom's re-instatement. I gather that it is a very popular issue and I do not think we need to worry about being too identified with anything shady he might possibly turn out. Issues like this, who is going to be our organizer can really hop up an opposition.

It is good to see that our fraction is really shaping up. I know that it must be quite a job for you..it takes a considerable time to develop even the best and most aggressive comrade to hit the floor and know how to put over an idea. Have you ever thought of suggesting to Bill that he should possibly consider getting into the IWA. what is the job situation in the trade now?

Looking forward to the IWA article on December 5th

comradely

Ross

November 30, 1949

Eve Smith
3525 West 27th Avenue
Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Comrade Smith-

Thank you very much for your book order. We have been delayed in replying to your letter as we received it while we were in the midst of a big redecorating job and everything was in a turmoil.

However we immediately shipped on to you . We had the following on stock.

4 copies of Wage Labor and Capital	1.00
4 copies of Value Price and Profit	1.00
4 copies of Socialism Utopian and Scientific	1.00
1 copy Revolution and Counter Revolution	1.00
2 copies of Communist Manifesto	.30

By now you should have received them. I hope that they are satisfactory. You will note that they are all International Publishers editions. One or two of these titles are obtainable in Kerr editions but they are in every way inferior to the Stalinist editions. The prices are possibly higher than you may have expected. As a matter of fact every order that we have placed with International and with Kerr has seen a considerable raise in price. Yesterday we completed our stock of Socialism Utopian and Scientific and were charged .30 cents a copy. Our previous stock from which your order was filled was .25 and this edition was originally published at .20 cents.

Neither Ancient Lowly nor The Positive Outcome of Philosophy are in print any longer. If you would like to read the latter I would only be too pleased to loan you a copy from my library. I seem to recall that Reg Bullock has a copy of the first book. I am sure he would be glad to loan it to you.

Yesterday we forwarded 2 copies of Civil War in France and 1 copy of 18th Brumaire to your address. I will send you the bill when we are informed of the present price. We have copies of Private Property and the State on hand but only in cloth. We are informed that the paper edition is no longer available. The price for this book will no doubt be in the neighbourhood of 2.50 a copy. We have not sent you any copies of this book as you specified paper and possibly you may think the price too high. Would you let us know ~~XXXX~~ whether you still want the 2 copies.

Do not trouble to send any more funds until we can correctly bill you for the full amount.

Unfortunately we have just been compelled to ditch our former book list as several items have gone out of print. We expect to get our new list drawn up within the next few weeks. We will send you one when it is available.

fraternally